A HISTORY OF INDIAN LITERATURE

JAN GONDA

THE RITUAL SŪTRAS

OTTO HARRASSOWITZ · WIESBADEN

Urheberrechtlich geschütztes Material

A HISTORY OF INDIAN LITERATURE

JAN GONDA

THE RITUAL SŪTRAS

OTTO HARRASSOWITZ · WIESBADEN

A HISTORY OF INDIAN LITERATURE

EDITED BY JAN GONDA

VOLUME I

Fasc. 2

1977

OTTO HARRASSOWITZ · WIESBADEN

JAN GONDA

THE RITUAL SŪTRAS

1977

OTTO HARRASSOWITZ · WIESBADEN

A HISTORY OF INDIAN LITERATURE

Contents of Vol. I

Vol. I: Veda and Upanishads

Fasc. 1:	J. Gonda	Vedic Literature (Saṃhitās and Brāhmaṇas)
Fasc. 2:	J. Gonda	The Ritual Sūtras
Fasc. 3:	J. Varenne	Upaniṣads

CIP-Kurztitelaufnahme der Deutschen Bibliothek

A history of Indian literature / ed. by Jan Gonda. – Wiesbaden : Harrassowitz.
NE: Gonda , Jan [Hrsg.]
Vol. 1. Veda and Upanishads. Fasc. 2. → Gonda , Jan : The ritual Sutras

Gonda, Jan
The ritual Sūtras. – Wiesbaden : Harrassowitz, 1977.
(A history of Indian literature ; Vol. 1, Veda and Upanishads ; Fasc. 2)
ISBN 3-447-01823-2

© Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden 1977. Alle Rechte vorbehalten. Photographische und photomechanische Wiedergabe nur mit ausdrücklicher Genehmigung des Verlages. Gesamtherstellung: Allgäuer Zeitungsverlag GmbH, Kempten. Printed in Germany. Sigel: HIL.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I *Introduction* 465

1. The literature 465
2. The authors 474

CHAPTER II *The śrautasūtras* 489

1. General introduction. The śrautasūtras of the Yajurveda 489
2. The relations between the brāhmaṇas and the śrautasūtras and the mutual relations of the latter 496
3. The mantras 502
4. Paribhāṣās, prāyaścittas and pariśiṣṭas 508
5. The individual śrautasūtras 514

CHAPTER III *The gṛhyasūtras* 546

1. General introduction 546
2. The contents of the gṛhyasūtras 556
3. The mantras 565
4. The individual gṛhyasūtras 582

CHAPTER IV *The pitṛmedhasūtras* 616

CHAPTER V *The ritual sūtras as historical sources* 622

CHAPTER VI *Style and composition* 629

CHAPTER VII *Transmission of the texts, commentaries and secondary literature* 648

Glossary 662

Abbreviations 664

Index 670

Jan Gonda

THE RITUAL SŪTRAS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1. The literature

In the later Vedic period the scholarly literature developed a new prose style, generally known as *sūtra* style. The term *sūtra*, for want of something better often translated by "aphorism", denotes, generally speaking, a large and varied number of "manuals of instruction"[1] and "systematic surveys or résumés".[2] Although part of the ancient Indian branches of learning have not preserved *sūtra* works marking the beginning of their literature[3] the hypothesis is legitimate that in the period mentioned and the succeeding centuries at least the most important disciplines came to fix their rules or tenets in the form of succinct résumés or manuals. The rise of this class of literature was largely caused by the need of reducing the growing mass of details preserved in circles of specialists in some branch of traditional knowledge. It cannot be disconnected from a method of teaching designed to enable the student to memorize vast and varied masses of facts, rules and other relevant information. Codifying and systematizing the various branches of knowledge it satisfied the needs of a system of oral instruction in which each stage in the exposition of a subject was to be learnt progressively and the whole of it, conveniently analyzed, was to be committed to memory.

Sūtra works, constituting a genre that is peculiar to India, are intended to present the essence of some doctrine systematically in a compact form. Generally speaking, they aim at precision and, especially, at brevity.[4] In order to

---

[1] The definition "manuals explaining the scriptures" (A. L. BASHAM, The wonder that was India, London 1956, p. 112) is not applicable to all *sūtras*; moreover, "explaining" can be misunderstood.

See especially L. RENOU, in JA 233 (1941—42), p. 105 and 251 (1963), p. 165.

[3] There exist traces of the existence, in olden times, of lost or recast *sūtra* works.

[4] Madhva (13th century), Brahmasūtrabhāṣya 1, 11 defined the term as follows:

achieve the utmost succinctness, repetitions and any other superfluities are avoided, references to the subjects or objects of sentences limited, finite verb forms eliminated.[5] The contents are compressed within a compass that does not exact too much from the student's memory. And in fact, this genre of literature, evolving for the facilitation of oral transmission and memorizing of knowledge, developed interesting devices for effecting this purpose, for instance careful arrangements of the subject-matter and a skilful composition of chapters and sections. The result generally consisted of long successions of short phrases which in many cases impress a modern reader as a sort of classified index of the subjects dealt with rather than a manual. Although a good many of them are grammatically complete and logically impeccable individual *sūtras* can hardly be disconnected from their context because they correlate to the *sūtras* which precede and follow them and are normally determined by the system of which they form part. This fundamental, though variable, conciseness of their style—which in the post-Vedic period tended to become more pronounced—as well as their thematic and conceptual interdependence presupposed, not only, on the part of the student, a sufficiency of general information on the subjects dealt with[6] but also the accompaniment of a teacher whose interpretation and comments had to make the brief notes comprehensible and to fill in all details needed for a complete understanding. In this respect we are at a disadvantage because we generally lack such authentic interpretations.

The name *sūtra* (literally "thread"), which is applicable to both the whole work and its individual sentences or paragraphs, has been variously explained, but there can be no doubt that it is taken from the image of weaving and of woven material made out of threads. A thread stretched out lengthwise as a warp to be crossed by the woof may continue—then *sūtra* becomes a name for the whole work—or it may be cut on both sides of the frame—then *sūtra* denotes the single paragraphs.[7]

"A *sūtra* consists of a small number of syllables, (of) intelligible (sentences), contains the essence, 'faces all sides' (does not focus attention on one subject), is free from insertions, (and) irreproachable".

[5] Particulars will be discussed in the chapter on style.

[6] They could not be "ignorant" (as was supposed by P. SABBATHIER, in JA 8, 15 (1890), p. 6).

[7] For this explanation see H. SCHARFE, Grammatical literature, in Vol. V of this History, p. 87. Other explanations do not, or not satisfactorily, account for the double use of the term (thus M. MONIER-WILLIAMS, Sanskrit-English dictionary, s.v.: "that which like a thread holds together everything, hence 'rule'; any work or manual consisting of strings of rules"); or are based on irrelevant images: e.g. RENOU(-FILLIOZAT), I.C. I, p. 301 "'fil (conducteur)', d'où 'règle'" (similarly, L. RENOU, Terminologie grammaticale du sanskrit, II, Paris 1942, p. 149; otherwise in Histoire de la langue sanskrite, Lyon and Paris 1956, p. 54: called after a rope of pearls; in JA 251, p. 166: because the rules *(sūtra)* knit together on an invisible thread); H. VON GLASENAPP, Die Literaturen Indiens, Stuttgart 1961, p. 44; 92: "Leitfaden". According to Rājaśekhara (see n. 8 below) a *sūtra* owes its name to

Before proceeding to treat the subject of this fascicle, the so-called *kalpa-sūtras*—as the various ceremonial guides or didactic manuals on ritual practice *(kalpa)*,[8] detailed expositions of the procedures and rules for the performance of Vedic sacrifices are comprehensively called[9]—I must make a rapid survey of the thematic material, that is the general contents of this class of *sūtra* literature.

Vedic ritual and liturgy in their fully developed form culminated in sacrifice[10] "on the practice and knowledge whereof man's welfare is based".[11] Homage to the divine powers consisted essentially of oblations thrown into the sacred fire, which as a divine person (Agni) was supposed to convey these to the gods *(deva)* or to invite the latter to dinner at the sacrificial place. The purpose of this ritual was the gratification of the gods in order to obtain from them benefits such as offspring, increase of cattle, a long lifetime, wealth, superiority, success in war. There are 'invariable' *(nitya)*, obligatory rites, some of them to be performed daily, others on precise dates of the lunar calendar; occasional *(naimittika)* ceremonies to be carried out on the occurrence of certain events; and optional *(kāmya)* rites performed by those who

---

the fact that it encircles *(sūtraṇa)* and includes many things within a limited space. Other authors leave the semantic change unexplained (among them BASHAM, op. cit., p. 112). See also SCHARFE, l. cit., n. 49.

[8] Compare Rājaśekhara's (ca. 900 A.D.) definition, Kāvyamīmāṃsā 2, 6: "*Kalpa* is (that) *sūtra*(text) which enjoins the employment of the *mantras* that belong to the various 'branches' (traditions: *śākhā*) of the Veda", and Kumārila, Tantravārttika, translated by G. JHA, Calcutta 1924, p. 224: "*kalpas* point out the methods of sacrifices, in the form of well-established regulations". The term *kalpa* (from *klp*- "to prepare, design, arrange, accomplish") is not, with Kashikar, S. Ś., p. 25 to be translated by "explanation (of the meaning of the Veda)". Ritual *(kalpa)* is one of the six *vedāṅgas* (for which see GONDA, V. L., p. 34), which originally were neither 'texts' (books) nor special 'schools' but subjects of instruction to be studied in order to understand the Vedic texts and to perform the rites. The purpose of the Veda is, according to the Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā, to lay down injunctions relating to the performance of rites, every part of it referring to acts of duty. See e.g. S. RADHAKRISHNAN, Indian philosophy II, London [5]1948, p. 388. The other five auxiliary branches of (Vedic) knowledge—*śikṣā* (the science of proper articulation and pronunciation); *chandas* (prosody); *vyākaraṇa* (grammar); *nirukta* (etymology); *jyotiṣa* (astronomy) cannot be dealt with in this volume; see the fascicles on Grammar, Metrics etc.

[9] More precisely, the term *kalpasūtra* includes also the *dharmasūtras* (see below); the *śulva*- and *pitṛmedhasūtras* have the character of adjuncts.

[10] For general information: A. HILLEBRANDT, Ritualliteratur (Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde, III, 2) Strassburg 1897 (more successful in the description of the *śrauta* than in that of the *gṛhya* rites; see also W. CALAND, in GGA 1897, p. 289); A. B. KEITH, The religion and philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads, Cambridge Mass. 1925, p. 313ff.; P. V. KANE, History of Dharmaśāstra, II, Poona 1941, p. 188ff.; 982ff.; L. RENOU, Religions of ancient India, London 1953, p. 29ff.; and in RENOU(-FILLIOZAT), I.C. I, p. 345ff.; J. GONDA, Die Religionen Indiens, I, Stuttgart 1960, p. 104ff.; SINGH, C. S. KŚS., p. 71; G. U. THITE, Sacrifice in the Brāhmaṇa-texts, Poona 1975; briefly e.g. M. A. MEHENDALE, in H.C.I.P. I, p. 474; V. M. APTE, ibidem, p. 497.

[11] VārŚS. 1, 1, 1, 1f. *prayoge puruṣahitaṃ yajñasya ca jñāne. taṃ vyākhyāsyāmaḥ.*

are desirous of special favours, personal advantages etc., and consisting of the ordinary procedures with the addition of special formulas. There is a further and very important distinction between the great, solemn rites, called *śrauta*—from *śruti*, the eternal and infallible truth 'heard' by the inspired sages *(ṛṣi)* of prehistoric antiquity and from the beginning orally transmitted in the *saṃhitās* and *brāhmaṇas* of the Veda[12]—which are dealt with in the *śrautasūtras* and the domestic rites, called *gṛhya* (domestic) and laid down in the *gṛhyasūtras* which, like the *dharmasūtras* and other classes of literature, are *smārta*, that is based on remembrance *(smṛti)*[13] and handed down by human intermediaries. The *śrauta* compendia, though treating of *śruti* material, are not included in the *śruti*, from which they derive their authority.[14] The *smṛti* texts,[15] of secondary importance, are regarded as authoritative as long as they are not contradicted by the *śruti*.

The complicated *śrauta* rites are carried out—on the invitation, at the expense and for the benefit of the patron or 'sacrificer' *(yajamāna)*, a well-to-do member of the higher classes—by specialized officiants (up to sixteen in number) and need three sacred fires, the formulas being taken from the *saṃhitās*. The domestic rites require one fire (the domestic, *gṛhya*, fire) and are as a rule performed by the householder himself using a formulary taken from a special collection. Some rites, however, function in different forms in the *śrauta* as well as the *gṛhya* ritual[16]—among them the (as a *śrauta* rite) comparatively simple *agnihotra*, i.e. the daily fire cult which is obligatory to every Aryan who maintains a perpetual sacred hearth and is simply an offering of milk, morning and evening, in the fire, the funeral ceremonies, the oblations of first-fruits *(āgrayaneṣṭi)*, the sacrifices of the full-moon and new-moon days. The rites mentioned last serve—in their *śrauta* variety—as the norm *(prakṛti)* for a number of other sacrificial ceremonies, viz. of the type called *iṣṭi*—requiring oblations of vegetable (rice, barley, cakes etc.) and the animal sacrifices *(paśubandha)*. The latter existed either independently or as an integral part of the *soma* sacrifices. *Soma* sacrifice is a comprehensive name of a considerable number of rites of variable length and complication, their basic or model form being the *agniṣṭoma*.[17] The sacrificer is first consecrated, the *soma* stalks are ceremoniously bought, and conveyed to the sacrificial place; the juice is pressed

---

[12] See GONDA, V. L., passim.

[13] For the terms *śruti* and *smṛti* see e.g. ŚGS. 2, 7, 15f.; 4, 9, 3; cf. also VārGS. 6, 32ff.; for *smārta* BDhŚ. 1, 1, 3; VārGS. 7, 11.

[14] Their authority is not independent and less than that of the *brāhmaṇas*; cf. Mīmāṃsā-sūtra 1, 3, 11f.; Kumārila, Tantravārttika, translated by G. JHA, p. 224; RENOU, in JA 251, p. 183; 200; KASHIKAR, S. Ś., p. 22.

[15] In a broader sense *smṛti* includes the Vedāṅgas, the Mahābhārata, the *purāṇas* etc. and especially the metrical *dharmaśāstras*. See also W. CALAND, Over de 'Wenschoffers', Amsterdam Acad. 1928, p. 25; SRINIVASA RAGHAVA AYYANGAR, in 4 AIOC 1927, S. P., 14, p. 35.

[16] See also GOPAL, I. V. K., p. 4; PILLAI, N. M., p. 31; cf. p. 24.

[17] W. CALAND and V. HENRY, L'agniṣṭoma, Paris 1906.

in three rounds from the plants, part of it being offered to the fire and part consumed by the officiants. Each of the three occasions is preceded and followed by recitations from the Ṛgveda-Saṃhitā (by the priest called *hotar* and his assistants) and chants from the Sāmaveda-Saṃhitā (by the *udgātar cum suis*). These ritual acts which take place in the morning are, in the main, repeated in the midday and, with a number of variations, in the evening service. There are long *soma* rituals lasting more than twelve days and called "sessions" *(sattra)*. The most impressive *soma* ceremonies, the royal consecration *(rājasūya)*, the so-called *vājapeya* and the horse sacrifice *(aśvamedha)* —rare and very expensive occasions—were reserved for princes. The sacrificer takes part in the sacrifice with his wife, pronouncing certain formulas and distributing the *dakṣiṇās*, ceremonial rewards, considered to constitute the final offering and by no means fees.

The domestic rites, which are often more closely related to everyday life, are brief ceremonies in which milk, butter or grain is offered. Some are daily or periodical practices, others are occasional offerings—for instance, the paying of honour to special guests *(arghya)*, the building of a house, the consecration of a tank of water. The most characteristic *gṛhya* rites are the so-called sacraments *(saṃskāra)*,[18] the Indian variant of the 'rites de passage'. They are "to make a person fit, to generate fresh qualities or a peculiar excellence"[19] and to fortify him at the moments of transition to a new period of life, such as impregnation, birth, naming, initiation and investiture with the sacred thread (*upanayana*, regarded as a new, spiritual birth), the return home of the youth ('Veda student') after the completion of his education *(samāvartana)*, marriage, death, those mentioned last being the most elaborate.

The rites called *pitṛmedha* which are to be performed by a son or a near relative for the benefit of the deceased are in some schools expounded in independent *sūtra* works, in others included either in the *śrautasūtras* or in the domestic manuals.

There are two other classes of ritual *sūtra* which, though closely connected with the subjects treated in the *śrauta* and *gṛhya* works, lie beyond the scope of this fascicle. The *dharmasūtras*,[20] dealing with correct behaviour (including the duties, rules of conduct, lawful occupations of the classes of society and the stages of life, ritual purity and dietary laws, punishments and penances, as well as various allied subjects) have some of their themes in common with the *gṛhyasūtras*,[21] but, due to the different angle from which they view ritual life, lay emphasis upon other aspects. Whereas moreover the outlook of the *gṛhya* compendia is mainly limited to the ritual of their own schools, the *dharma* works claim to instruct the whole Aryan society. The fourth allied group of

[18] See also R. B. PANDEY, Hindu saṃskāras, Banaras 1949.

[19] See the quotations in KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 190f.

[20] I refer to J. D. M. DERRETT, Dharmaśāstra and juridical literature, in vol. IV of this History, esp. p. 28ff. See also RENOU, Écoles, p. 13; GOPAL, I. V. K., p. 2.

[21] See below, chapter III, 1.

these texts is that of the *śulvasūtras* which are directly attached to the *śrauta-sūtras*; belonging to the latest period of production of Vedic *sūtras*, they contain minute rules regarding the measurement and construction of the fire-places and sacrificial grounds.[22]

The *śrauta-* and *gṛhya-sūtras* are not only of great value as literary documents, as indispensable sources for the correct understanding of many passages in other Vedic texts, as fine specimens of a most interesting stylistic genre. They are also unique as ritual handbooks and mines of information on that which has always fascinated the Indian mind to a high degree, viz. the technique enabling the man who knows to exert influence upon the Unseen. No other nation of antiquity has left us so detailed, considered, and systematic descriptions of their ritual and ceremonial as the Vedic specialists. Part of these works, especially of the *śrautasūtras*, are indeed so voluminous, so comprehensive, so complicated, so full of well-considered and thoroughly coherent ritual prescriptions, full also of minute details and technical terms; they presuppose such an intimate familiarity with the theory and fundamentals of the ritual; their contents are so much a systematic whole that it gives a modern student a great deal of trouble to become thoroughly acquainted with the purport of the single prescriptions, the intentions of the successive clauses and stipulations and the modes of expression adopted by their authors. This explains that these works have the reputation of making a little attractive field of study and inquiry[23] and that in histories of Indian literature and anthologies they are often somewhat neglected.[24]

The *sūtra* collections dealt with in this fascicle belong to the Vedic *saṃhitās* to which their contents are closely attached. More precisely, however, they are part of the literary property of the 'schools'[25] into which the tradition of each Veda branched off. It cannot even be doubted that these schools did not, or could not, claim to have reached a certain measure of independence or recognized individuality before they had produced a *sūtra* collection of their own. Since the *śrautasūtras* are in their contents and in respect of their very raison d'être closely connected with the *brāhmaṇas*[26] and every class of sacri-

[22] These texts are discussed in the fascicles on mathematics, technics and architecture. — For other works composed in *sūtra* style, e.g. the Sarvānukramaṇī of the Ṛgveda see RENOU, in JA 251, p. 201; GONDA, V. L., p. 35; for the Nidāna-sūtra, GONDA, V. L., p. 321. — Excepting the Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā the *sūtras* of the (philosophical) *darśanas* have little in common with the *kalpasūtras*.

[23] See e.g. J. PH. VOGEL, Levensbericht van Willem Caland (in Amsterdam Acad., Jaarboek 1932—1933), p. 31; "the *śrautasūtras* constitute a most unattractive" (MACDONELL, H. S. L., p. 249) or "an uninteresting form of literature" (SINGH, K. Ś. S., p. XVI).

[24] WINTERNITZ, G. I. L. I, p. 232—240 deals with all the *sūtras* (including those on *dharma* and *śulva*) in eight pages, VON GLASENAPP, L. I., p. 92 in less than one page. V. RAGHAVAN, The Indian heritage, Bangalore 1956 (an anthology of Sanskrit literature) omitted the *sūtras*.

[25] Compare GONDA, V. L., p. 29ff.

[26] For particulars see chapter II, 2 below.

fice, every collection of *mantras* could, in principle, give rise to a double ritualistic treatment—one in a *brāhmaṇa* and one in a *sūtra*—the supposition that the *sūtra* literature as a genre has originated partly in and partly immediately after the period in which the Yajurveda-Saṃhitās and the *brāhmaṇas* were in the making[27]—one should not[28] distinguish a '*sūtra* period' following a '*brāhmaṇa* period'—has much to recommend it. No hard and fast line can from the structural and stylistic points of view be drawn between *brāhmaṇa* and *sūtra* literature. As observed elsewhere[29] some portions of the former class have the character of *sūtra* texts; book V of the Aitareya-Āraṇyaka is, to mention only this, written in the regular *sūtra* style.[30] On the other hand, considerable parts of the *sūtra* works of Baudhāyana or Vadhūla are clothed in the style of the *brāhmaṇas*.[31] Nor is the hypothesis illegitimate that the *śrautasūtras* as a class are older than the other classes of *sūtra* literature. The *gṛhyasūtras*, which are much less nearly allied to the material discussed in the *brāhmaṇas*, create the strong impression of being, generally speaking, modelled upon the *śrautasūtras*. This genesis would explain the comparative unity of the plan and the underlying ideas of both groups of *kalpasūtras* which moreover constitute the only groups of *sūtras* that are clearly affiliated with preceding and extant collections of literary works. Part of the *dharmasūtras*—which, as already observed, have many themes in common with the *gṛhya* works—may have followed the latter also chronologically, the composition of others was no doubt contemporaneous with texts of that class.

Whereas the *dharma* and *gṛhya* works on one hand, and the *gṛhya* and *śrauta* compendia on the other are to a certain extent each other's complements—the unity of the ritual (*kalpaikatva*, ŚGS. 1, 1, 13) determines that of the domains of the *śrauta* and *gṛhya* practices—, the *kalpasūtras* belonging to different Vedas have this character in a large measure. A complete understanding of a rite and a thorough insight into the significance of all its details can in most cases not be reached unless all relevant *sūtra* texts are studied at the same time and as a coherent whole.[32] The functions of the four Vedas being comparable, to quote

---

[27] It is very difficult to say if, or to what extent, the rise of Buddhism "gave the first impetus to the composition of systematic manuals of brāhmaṇic worship" (MACDONELL, H. S. L., p. 246).

[28] With MAX MÜLLER, History of ancient Sanskrit literature, London 1859 (1860; 1912; 1926), p. 70 etc.; WEBER, I. S. IX, p. 354; E. W. HOPKINS, in C. H. I. I, p. 220ff. and others. BASHAM's (op. cit., p. 112) view (with the passage of time the sacrificial instructions of the *brāhmaṇas* became obscure and the *sūtras* were composed to elucidate them) is beside the mark.

[29] GONDA, V. L., p. 320; 424; 427.

[30] For particulars see A. B. KEITH, The Aitareya Āraṇyaka, Oxford 1909 (1969), p. 68; 297; S. BHAWE, Die Yajus' des Aśvamedha, Stuttgart 1939, p. 70; 75. See e.g. TS. 5, 5, 11—24; 5, 6, 11—23; 5, 7, 11—26.

[31] See below, chapter II, 5.

[32] CALAND and HENRY, L'agniṣṭoma is a model of scholarly reconstruction based on the relevant texts. A similar work describing the fire offering is P. E. DUMONT, L'agnihotra. Description de l'agnihotra dans le rituel védique d'après les śrauta-

Caland,[33] to the parts of the players of a string quartette the rôle of the *hotar* cum suis (i.e. the *hautra*)[34] must be learnt from the *sūtras* of the Ṛgveda, the office of the chanters *(audgātra)* from those of the Sāmaveda, the activities of the *adhvaryu*—the officiant who is in charge of the manual operations and mutters the sacrificial formulas *(yajus)* and his assistants (i.e. the *ādhvaryava*)—from the Yajurveda;[35] as to the task of the *brahman* priest *(brahmatva)* he owes his dignity to the "sap extracted from the other Vedas",[36] although the Atharvavedins claim his close connexion with the atharvanic tradition.[37] If these works, therefore, constitute, in a sense, a unity or a whole in themselves they are on the other hand neither completely homogeneous in style and contents nor free from every sort of divergence. Some compiler recommends a departure from traditional rules that are commonly observed or at least approved of in other schools, others like to make mention of variations in ritual practice[38] or differences of opinion. Contradictions are not rare and, like ambiguities, found even in the same compendium. This becomes intelligible when we take into consideration that a good deal of the contents of these works—tending to exhaustiveness as they are—is common property, some *sūtra* texts striking one almost as patchwork. Contradictions arising from the use of different sources were not always smoothed away, sometimes, no doubt, from negligence but in other cases because many Indian authors felt inclined to admit the validity of two possibilities which a modern Westerner would regard as contradictory. The principle of unanimity (consistency in meaning, *ekavākyatā*) of all relevant texts, recognized by later commentators may moreover have made its influence felt. However, it may be true that *sūtras* belonging to the same Veda resemble each other in many respects, an original *kalpasūtra* cannot be reconstructed.

On the other hand, the ambiguities in the wording of the *sūtras* and earlier *kalpa* works as well as the fact that the oral explanations of the teachers were not as rigidly recorded as the texts themselves did not fail to produce modifications of the traditional opinions and interpretations which in course of time—

---

sūtras de Kātyāyana (Yajurveda blanc); Āpastamba, Hiraṇyakeśin, Baudhāyana, Manu (Yajurveda noir); Āśvalāyana, Śāṅkhāyana (Ṛgveda); et le Vaitāna-Sūtra (Atharvaveda), Baltimore 1939; an older work of this character is J. Schwab, Das altindische Thieropfer, Erlangen 1886. For the Śrautakośa see chapter II, 1, n. 23.

[33] Caland, Ś. Ā. I, p. 4.

[34] For these functions and other technical details see e. g. Keith, R. Ph. V. U., p. 315ff.; Gonda, R. I. I, p. 142.

[35] For further details see p. 493 below.

[36] See KB. 6, 11; AiB. 5, 32, 3; ŚB. 11, 5, 8, 4; this functionary must be acquainted with all three Vedas (see e.g. ĀpŚS. 24, 1, 19; VārŚS. 1, 1, 1, 6; ĀpYPS. 19).

[37] Including other texts; see Gonda, V. L., p. 269.

[38] Which may, at least in our eyes, be rather insignificant; thus the followers of Kutsa pronounced a definite formula as *bhūr bhuvaḥ svaḥ hiṃ*, not like the others as *hiṃ bhūr bhuvaḥ svaḥ* (ĀśvŚS. 1, 2, 5).

more precisely, in the post-Ṛgvedic period when the rituals came to develop considerably—led to deliberate separations of groups of followers of a school. So different branches of a school may not only form divergent views of statements in the *śruti* but also give different interpretations of the same *sūtra*. Much documentary evidence of this process is however lost, notwithstanding the fact that in the course of the last century several texts have been discovered in Indian libraries.[39] That at one time there must have existed many more works of this genre appears from the occurrence of names of teachers or authorities preserved in some of our texts. The Baudhāyana-Sūtras for instance mention a considerable number of them.[40] Although it is not clear how far all more or less obscure authorities have been not only teachers but also composers of compendia, their very number attests to the prevalence of spirited teaching and animated discussions.[41] It is even a plausible supposition that the compendia which have been preserved do not constitute the oldest and original *kalpa* 'literature'; already at an early date a thorough and orderly comprehension of the ritual methods must have called for some sort of oral compilations of prescripts[42] based on the traditions of priestly 'schools' and popular customs. Nevertheless the number of complete corpora treating of all the divisions of ritual practice *(kalpa)* is limited to a few, viz. the corpora of Baudhāyana,[43] Āpastamba and Hiraṇyakeśin which, being chiefly based on the Yajurveda in the Taittirīya recension[44] and therefore primarily[45] intended for the benefit of the *adhvaryu* priests in whose families the study of this recension is hereditary, set forth the teaching of the Veda and of the ancient authorities regarding the performance of the rites and the socio-religious duties of the Aryans.[46] It is not beyond possibility that these three Taittirīya schools have been the only ones to produce such complete corpora named after their founders. Anyhow, the *kalpa* works belonging to the other Vedas are deficient in *dharma-* and (or) *śulvasūtras*. In other cases however the single *sūtra* texts are not regarded as parts of one and the same corpus; their comparative independence

[39] For some particulars about these discoveries see CALAND, Über ... Baudhāyana, p. 1ff.; Über das Vādhūlasūtra, AO (Lugd.) 1, p. 3; 2, p. 142; 6, p. 97; PARPOLA, J. A.; M. WITZEL, in SII 1 (1975), p. 75; L. A. RAVI VARMA, Āgniveśyagṛhyasūtra, Trivandrum 1940, p. VIff.

[40] See CALAND, Über ... Baudhāyana, p. 35. For particulars on this neglected subject of study see chapters I, 2; II, 5.

[41] Pāṇini 4, 3, 105 mentions *brāhmaṇas* and *kalpa* (works) proclaimed by ancient (authorities).

[42] See also KASHIKAR, S. Ś., p. 25 (from the orthodox point of view); p. 27f.

[43] See also CALAND, Über ... Baudhāyana, p. 12f.; B. V. KAMESVARA AIYER, in QJMS 13, p. 529.

[44] See GONDA, V. L., p. 350; 357 etc.

[45] It should be noticed that in the Ṛgvedic ĀśvŚS. prescripts are sometimes also given to officiants other than the *hotar*, when for instance they have to perform a task together with that priest (e.g. 1, 10, 4); similarly in other *sūtras*.

[46] The Vaikhānasas possess a corpus comprising the *śrauta* and *smārta* (*gṛhya* and *dharma*) *sūtras*; there are Mānava *śrauta*, *gṛhya* and *śulva sūtras*, etc.

may even appear from the absence of uniform names: the Śrauta-sūtra of the White Yajurveda is attributed to Kātyāyana, but the Gṛhyasūtra is commonly known as Pāraskara's manual.[47]

2. *The authors*

A few general observations on the names, personal identities, times and native countries of the authors as well as on their sources or predecessors may precede the chapters on the individual works, their contents and characteristics. The authors or compilers of the ritual *sūtras* bear for the greater part other names than those of the *brāhmaṇas*. Indian tradition being much inclined to ascribe to famous teachers and heads of schools the origin of important and authoritative texts, even when such an ascription is contrary to fact, these authorities have often lent their names to the works of their successors or followers. For all their fame and influence they belong to the shadowy past. This is however not to deny them a certain individuality.

Some names of *sūtrakāras* occur in the lists of Vedic teachers recorded in *gṛhya* and *dharma* works where they describe the *tarpaṇa* ceremony[1] which consists in offering water to gods, sages and the deceased ancestors: Bharadvāja,[2] Jaimini,[3] Gautama,[4] Suyajña Śāṅkhāyana,[5] Āśvalāyana,[6] Kāṇva (or Kaṇva) Baudhāyana,[7] Āpastamba,[8] Satyāṣāḍha Hiraṇyakeśin,[9] Āgniveśya.[10] These teachers—and others whose names can be omitted—"belonged to noble families and were anchorites who lived in perpetual celibacy".[11] Information

[47] In anthologies, collections of translations from Sanskrit texts the ritual *sūtras* are not always adequately represented. Mention may be made of L. Renou, Anthologie sanskrite, Paris 1947; J. Varenne, Le Véda, Paris 1967.

[1] For this see Kane, H.Dh. II, p. 689.

[2] ĀśvGS. 3, 4, 2; ŚGS. 4, 10, 3; BGS. 3, 9, 6; BhGS. 3, 10; 11 *(bharadvājāya sūtrakārāya)*.

[3] ĀśvGS. 3, 4, 4; ŚGS. 4, 10, 3.

[4] ĀśvGS. 3, 4, 4; HGS. 2, 19, 6; BhGS. 3, 10.

[5] ĀśvGS. 3, 4, 4; ŚGS. 4, 10, 3; ŚāmbGS. in Weber, I. S. XV, p. 154; from these lists and Ānartīya on ŚŚS. 1, 2, 18 it may be inferred that Suyajña was his proper name, Śāṅkhāyana his family name (see Oldenberg, G. S. I, p. 3; Kashikar, S. Ś., p. 86).—Names in *-āyana* are rare in the oldest texts.

[6] ĀśvGS. 3, 4, 4; ŚGS. 4, 10, 3; BDhŚ. 2, 5, 9, 14 *(āśvalāyanaṃ śaunakam)*.

[7] BGS. 3, 9, 6; BDhŚ. 2, 5, 9, 14; BhGS. 3, 11.

[8] BGS. 3, 9, 6 and BDhŚ. 2, 5, 9, 14 *(apastamba(ṃ) sūtrakāra(m))*; BhGS. 3, 11.

[9] BDhŚ. 2, 5, 9, 14; BGS. 3, 9, 6 and HGS. 2, 20, 1 (*satyāṣāḍhāya*, preceded by "for the *sūtrakāras* (in general)").

[10] BGS. 3, 9, 6.

[11] BGS. 3, 9, 6; cf. BhGS. 3, 11.

may also be drawn from commentators. Ṣaḍguruśiṣya[12] (12th century) for instance makes some statements with regard to Āśvalāyana and his teacher Śaunaka. When the former "who knew everything he had learnt from that teacher had composed a *sūtra*" Śaunaka is said to have destroyed his own *sūtra* and ordered that his pupil's work should be adopted by the students of his *śākhā* of the Veda.[13] According to another, unverifiable, tradition recorded by Devasvāmin,[14] the oldest commentator on Āśvalāyana's *sūtra* work, the Śrautasūtra attributed to this author was the work of Śaunaka and the Gṛhyasūtra that of Āśvalāyana. Irrespective of other problems of identity and authorship connected with the name Śaunaka[15] it must be noticed that many quotations ascribed to him occur in the *sūtra* works of Āśvalāyana and that the latter at the end of his *śrauta* work (12, 15, 14) pays homage to the *ācāryas* and Śaunaka, and at the end (4, 8, 44) of the domestic manual to the latter. It has therefore been supposed that there is some truth in Ṣaḍguruśiṣya's statements.[16] Yet there are many quotations ascribed to Śaunaka in other works so that the hypothesis that once there existed a *sūtra* work of his hand is perfectly legitimate.[17] Or was it only *honoris causa* ascribed to the teacher ? Or was the work in a certain period ascribed to both authors ? As already mentioned, the reputed author of the other ṛgvedic *śrauta-* and *gṛhyasūtras* probably was Suyajña Śāṅkhāyana notwithstanding the name Guṇākhya Śāṅkhāyana found in the list of teachers at the end of the Śāṅkhāyana-Āraṇyaka.[18]

Generally speaking, all of these *sūtrakāras* are very shadowy figures.[19] In several cases the probabilities even are in favour of the supposition that a work was, at least in its present form, 'edited' or revised by members of the family of the ancient authority who gave his name to it or in his school. In discussing this point with reference to Baudhāyana there has been a controversy between Bühler,[20] who regarded those passages which contain the name of the 'author'[21] as interpolated, and Caland,[22] who from these places (and other evidence)

[12] Ṣaḍguruśiṣya, in his commentary on the Sarvānukramaṇī. Cf. GONDA, V. L., p. 40 etc.

[13] Cf. GONDA, V. L., p. 31; 34; 427; OLDENBERG, G. S. I, p. 153.

[14] Devasvāmin, on ĀśvGS., Introduction.

[15] Cf. GONDA, V. L., p. 34; 35; 37; 427.

[16] In his commentary on Kātyāyana's Sarvānukramaṇī, see A. A. MACDONELL, Kātyāyana's Sarvānukramaṇī, Oxford 1886, p. VI; OLDENBERG, G.S. I, p. 153.

[17] On the problem of their relation—which is complicated by the question of the authorship of the fourth and fifth books of the Aitareya-Āraṇyaka (see GONDA, V. L., p. 427)—see K. PARAMESWARA AITHAL, Āśvalāyana-Gṛhya-Pariśiṣṭa, Adyar-Madras 1964, p. 11; GOPAL, I. V. K., p. 21; KASHIKAR, S. Ś., p. 80. However, most prose quotations attributed to Śaunaka are found in the sūtras of Āśvalāyana.

[18] Cf. also OLDENBERG, G. S. I, p. 4.

[19] Occasionally a text is anonymous; e.g. the Śrautakārikā, published by GAASTRA, B. K. V. R., p. 36.

[20] BÜHLER, in S. B. E. XIV, p. XXXVI.

[21] See e.g. BŚS. 4, 11: 127, 15; 7, 4: 205, 3; 14, 15: 180, 7; *pravarapraśna* 1: 415, 7; cf. also BhGS. 1, 9; ŚGS. 4, 10, 3; ĀśvGS. 3, 4, 4.

[22] CALAND, Über . . . Baudhāyana, p. 6.

inferred that the works constituting the Baudhāyana corpus were composed by ritualists who followed the teachings of this authority. Although the hypothesis of one or more revisions seems probable,[23] the question may arise, whether these authors could not sometimes—for instance at the end of a section "thus says the reverend"[24]—refer to themselves in the third person. In view of the above tradition calling Baudhāyana Kāṇva Caland[25] also ventured the supposition that this author—whose work gives evidence of certain relations with the Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā—had been a follower of the White Yajurveda before becoming a Taittirīya. The name of Āpastamba does not occur in the ancient Vedic texts.[26] Perhaps it was, probably like Gobhila and Pāraskara, a real personal name, not a school or family name.

As to the question of the identity of the authorship of the different *sūtras* belonging to the same tradition,[27] one will in almost all cases find much difficulty in putting it beyond doubt.[28] It seems that the *śrauta-* and *gṛhyasūtras* of the Maitrāyaṇī recension stand a fair chance of being composed by the same person,[29] a Mānava and a Vārāha respectively. In other cases, for instance that of Śāṅkhāyana, the problem has been left undecided.[30] A point which is worth examining more systematically concerns the occurrence of two variants of essentially identical rites that are ascribed to two different authorities.[31]

The texts themselves do not give chronological indications. The order of the names in the lists of teachers mentioned in the *tarpaṇa* section of some *gṛhya-sūtras* are hardly reliable in the matter of relative chronology,[32] to say nothing of fixed periods. In the present state of research it is impossible to assign any precise dates to the composition of the individual works. Many definite dates suggested in modern books are little more than guesses unsupported by cogent arguments but based on disputable deductions or unconvincing considerations. Whereas some authors wisely confine themselves to statements such as "the general period of the *sūtras* extends from the sixth or seventh century before Christ to about the second century",[33] others, overlooking the necessity to

---

[23] Compare also CALAND, in AO 2, p. 146; KASHIKAR, in JGJRI 15, p. 157.

[24] ĀgnGS. 2, 4, 3: 62, 16; 2, 4, 5: 65, 5 etc.

[25] W. CALAND, Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, Kāṇvīya recension I, Lahore 1926, p. 100. Cf. RENOU, Écoles, p. 14; 174.

[26] The references in ĀpDhS. 1, 2, 5, 4 and 2, 6, 13, 10 to people of later ages give no information on his person as is supposed by KANE, H. Dh. I, p. 44.

[27] For the problem of the identity of the authors of the *gṛhya-* and *dharmasūtras* see GOPAL, I. V. K., p. 8.

[28] See also OLDENBERG, in S. B. E. XXIX, p. 5.

[29] For Mānava see P. v. BRADKE, in ZDMG 36, p. 450. Cf. KASHIKAR, S. Ś., p. 157.

[30] For Āśvalāyana see p. 475 above.

[31] E.g. BGŚS. 1, 23, 20: ĀgnGS. 2, 4, 6.

[32] For instance, at ŚGS. 4, 10, 3 Śāṅkhāyana precedes the ancient authorities Aitareya and Śākalya. Moreover, the lists do not mention the names in the same order.

[33] E. W. HOPKINS, in C. H. I. I, p. 227. GOPAL, I. V. K., p. 89: "most of the *sūtras* were composed between ca. 800 B.C. and 500 B.C." (too early); "the actual

study the complex of this literature as a whole,[34] could not resist the temptation to settle the age of a definite work within narrow limits.[35]

Much importance has often been attached to deductions from more or less correct grammatical usage, that is conformity with the rules of Pāṇini.[36] These arguments are precarious, first because there have always been authors who did not keep close to the famous grammar, secondly because Pāṇini's date also can be fixed only approximately (5th or perhaps 6th century B.C. ?),[37] and finally because archaic words or forms[38] or so-called irregularities are not necessarily indications of an early date: they may belong to the peculiarities of the locality or community in which definite works had their origin. Nor can references to the formation of the names of Pāraskara and Āpastamba in the Pāṇinian corpus[39] be an argument of great weight, for even if the *sūtrakāras* are meant[40] they may have been famous for earlier texts than those in our possession. The supposed allusions to Buddhism fail to impress me very much.[41]

---

sūtras excluding *brāhmaṇa* passages do not go back beyond the 5th century B.C." (KEITH, in JRAS 1909, p. 591); RENOU(-FILLIOZAT), I. C. I, p. 302 assigns the *śrauta* works to 400—200 B.C.

[34] GOPAL, I. V. K., p. 68—92 meritoriously made an attempt in this direction without however arriving at wholly convincing conclusions. Reliance on a few arguments relating to two or three works can even lead an author to contradict himself; cf. KANE, H. Dh. I, p. 29f.; 44f.

[35] E.g. KEITH, R. Ph. V. U., p. 28: "Āśvalāyana may be assigned with reasonable probability to about 400 B.C."; and in JRAS 1909, p. 591: Śāṅkhāyana-Śrauta-sūtra a little later than 400 B.C.; see also V. B. Y. S., p. XLV; CLXXI; KASHIKAR, S. Bh. I, p. XCV: "Bodhāyana flourished about 800 B.C., Āpastamba about 550 B.C., Bhāradvāja about 650—600 B.C.". As to Baudhāyana CALAND (Über ... Baudhāyana, p. 11) surmised 6th century B.C. or later.

[36] See e.g. G. BÜHLER, The sacred laws of the Aryas I, in S. B. E. II, ²Oxford 1896, p. XLIII; HILLEBRANDT, Rit., p. 24; A. A. MACDONELL, The Bṛhad-devatā I, Cambridge Mass. 1904, p. XXII; A. B. KEITH, The Aitareya-Āraṇyaka, Oxford 1909, p. 21; V. B. Y. S., p. XLV; CLXVII; CLXXII, GOPAL, I. V. K., p. 68; 74; 86; 88; C. M. PANSE, The antiquity of the gṛhyasūtras, in VIJ 1 (1963), p. 287. Attention is drawn to such gerunds (absolutives) as *gṛhya, kṛtya, uṣya* etc. (which however occur also in the Mahābhārata); the rarity of infinitives.—KASHIKAR's (S. Ś., p. 149) argument in connexion with Pāṇini 1, 2, 35: ŚŚS. 1, 1, 34f. is not cogent.

[37] See H. SCHARFE, Grammatical literature, in this History, V, p. 88.

[38] See also R. P. KANGLE in Vol. Renou, p. 423.

[39] Pāṇini 4, 3, 103; 6, 1, 157; *gaṇapāṭha* 164 on 4, 1, 104. KEITH, V. B. Y. S., p. CLXVII; GOPAL, I. V. K., p. 73; 75; 82.

[40] According to the Mahābhāṣya and the Kāśikā-Vṛtti on Pāṇini 6, 1, 157 Pāraskara is the name of a country.

[41] See e.g. WEBER, I. L., ²p. 86 on a later date of LŚS. because of 8, 6, 28 (see also KŚS. 22, 4, 24) *brahmabandhur māgadhadeśīyaḥ*, an expression that may denote a considerable variety of people other than Buddhists. According to K. MYLIUS, in ZMR 51, p. 248 Āśvalāyana was identical with "the young brahmin, very learned in the three Vedas" Assalāyano in Majjhima-Nikāya, S. 93 (?). Cases of irregular *sandhi* (SŪRYAKĀNTA, Kauthuma-Gṛhya, Calcutta 1956, p. 10) should be attributed to other causes than "the influence of the faulty Buddhist Sanskrit". Compare also

They are almost always questionable and capable of a better interpretation. Even if such an argument could carry conviction it shows, in the case of positive evidence, no more than that the text—or passage—cannot date further back than ± 500 B.C., and if the evidence is negative it does not prove that the text is of earlier origin, because absence of references to Buddhism may be due to social or geographical factors as well.[42]

What can be said with certainty is that the ritual *sūtras* were not composed at one and the same time and that some of them are separated from others by a fairly long interval; further that this interval coincides with the period between the older Vedic[43] and the epic literatures.[44] What can be attempted is the tentative fixation of the upper and lower limits of the period during which the works that are known to us were given their present forms as well as a provisional survey of the relative chronology of the main individual *sūtra* texts. Whereas the absolute and relative force of most single arguments is difficult to judge, independent cumulative evidence of some reliability may carry weight and on occasions support an ancient tradition.[45]

It is often said that the *gṛhyasūtras* were composed a little later than the *śrautasūtras* and a little earlier than the *dharmasūtras*. Weighty arguments in support of the assumption that the domestic manuals were drawn up in their present form at a later date are the fact that they generally speaking presuppose their *śrautasūtras*, refer to them or copy phrases or whole *sūtras* from them;[46] that they tend to withdraw from the strict school traditions[47] and the many signs of the influence which the Ṛgveda and the Atharvaveda have had upon the domestic ritual described in the non-ṛgvedic *gṛhya* works.[48] It should however be remembered, first that the dates of the ancient *dharma* works have not been fixed either (ca. 600—ca. 200 B.C.?),[49] and in the second place that the

---

Keith, R. Ph. V. U., p. 20f.; 29. Occurrences of brahmin family names (such as Bhāradvāja) in ancient Buddhist works do not help us any further.

[42] For an interesting but unconvincing attempt to fix the date of Baudhāyana on astronomical grounds (BŚS. 25, 5: about 1330 B.C.) see Gorakh Prasad, in JRAS 1936, p. 417.

[43] From the occurrence of passages in *sūtra* style in *brāhmaṇas* (Gonda, V. L., p. 350; 420; 424) it should not, with S. Bhawe, Die Yajus' des Aśvamedha, Stuttgart 1939, p. 45, be inferred that the *sūtra* literature as such is older than the *brāhmaṇa* literature.

[44] As appears from a study of the metres of the verses occurring in the *gṛhyasūtras* (H. Oldenberg, in The Gṛhya-sūtras II, S. B. E. XXX, p. XIV) this interval coincides also with the transitional period in the development of the *anuṣṭubh*.

[45] Compare e.g. Gopal, I. V. K., p. 77 on the *sūtras* of Bhāradvāja. One should not, for instance, try to argue ĀśvGS. an old work only because of the availability of an (incompletely) accented version (ed. B. R. Ghanekar, Bombay 1909).

[46] Cf. Oldenberg, in S. B. E. XXX, p. XXXI; Hillebrandt, Rit., p. 20.

[47] Compare Kangle, op. cit., p. 415.

[48] Compare Gonda, V. L., p. 30; 345; 368; 369; S. R. Sehgal, Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtram, Delhi 1960, p. 36.

[49] See J. D. M. Derrett, Dharmaśāstra and juridical literature, in this History, IV, p. 28ff.; Macdonell, H. S. L., p. 260; 432; Basham, op. cit., p. 112.

so-called *gṛhya* and *dharma* periods have no doubt largely overlapped. We cannot adopt the rigid separation of periods suggested by some of our predecessors and should likewise guard against the mistaken belief that all *śrauta* works are older than the rest of the *sūtra* literature. We should, moreover, take full account of the possibility of interpolations and later additions, recasts or displacements.[50] Too little attention has been paid to the probability of more or less complete revisions or even replacements, at various periods, of older works, lost to us, by new *sūtras* with the result that some of the latter extended into comparatively late centuries. The contents of a *sūtra* work may be representative of a period preceding the redaction by many years.[51] Conclusions with regard to a definite *śrautasūtra* or *dharmasūtra* cannot be regarded as valid for the *gṛhyasūtra* of the same school unless these works are very intimately allied to each other.[52]

Although in fixing the relative chronology of individual works references to other treatises may be helpful—for instance, the mention of the Mīmāṃsā in VārGS. 6, 32 prevents dating before the 1st century B.C.—, they present several difficulties: the dates of the other works are as a rule not less uncertain; sometimes the relevant passages are not necessarily of the same age as the *sūtras* of which they form part; supposed references are not always clearly recognizable, identifiable, or intelligible.[53] Identity or similarity of wording in two texts hardly permit arguing that one is derived from the other because both works may have incorporated the same traditional formulation.[54] On the other hand, more or less evident instances of borrowing may guide us to the solution of a chronological problem, but here also one should proceed with caution;[55] a given *sūtra* work may have borrowed from a *sūtra* text of another school, but also from the latter's *brāhmaṇa*;[56] even a more logical position of a *sūtra* may

[50] See e.g. R. GARBE, The Śrauta Sūtra of Āpastamba, III, Calcutta 1902, p. XIV; CALAND, Ś. Ś. S., p. XII; KASHIKAR, S. Bh. I, p. XCIV; KANGLE, op. cit., p. 422. There can be no doubt that the Baudhāyana-Gṛhya-Paribhāṣā-sūtra (see J. GONDA, in Volume Waldschmidt, 1977) and many portions of the Gṛhya-Pariśiṣṭasūtra (see P. N. U. HARTING, Selections from the Baudhāyana-Gṛhya-pariśiṣṭasūtra, Thesis Utrecht 1922, p. XV; XXIII) are later additions.

[51] CALAND, in GGA 1902, p. 122 incorrectly generalizes in suggesting that (all) *sūtras* are, as to their contents, synchronous with the *saṃhitās*.

[52] Cf. e.g. H. J. W. SALOMONS, Het Hindoesche huisritueel volgens de school van Bhāradvāja, Thesis Utrecht 1913, p. XIV; GOPAL, op. cit., p. 78; SŪRYAKĀNTA, op. cit., p. 107. There are for instance no reasonable grounds for the conclusion that HGS. is completely dependent on ĀpGS. because HDhS. has appropriated ĀpDhS.; see GOPAL, op. cit., p. 77.

[53] See e.g. BÜHLER, in S. B. E. II, p. XLff. on ĀpDhS. 1, 2, 5, 4ff.; GOPAL, op. cit., p. 68 on BD. 4, 139; is this really "an explicit reference" to ĀśvGS. 2, 6, 12?; GOPAL, p. 74 etc.

[54] See also J. M. VAN GELDER, Opbouw van het hoogaltaar naar de overlevering der Mānavas, Mānava Śrauta-sūtra cayana, Thesis Utrecht 1919 (²Leiden 1921), p. XII.

[55] The frequency of similarities is not insignificant; cf. v. GELDER, op. cit., p. XIII.

[56] Cf. CALAND, in GGA 1904, p. 249; in AO 9, p. 69.

be deceptive.[57] When however a *gṛhyasūtra* often refers to the *śrautasūtra* of the same school the conclusion must be that the former is posterior to the latter.[58]

Since the practice of quoting *ślokas* is not peculiar to *gṛhyasūtras* but also to *dharma* works one should hesitate to rely on the identity of certain places in the Manu-Smṛti[59] in favour of the supposition that the Kauṣītaki-Gṛhyasūtra has quoted from that well-known work. Both works may have drawn upon the floating mass of proverbial sayings or memorial stanzas[60] some of which were attributed to mythical or legendary authorities among them Manu. It is also in view of the fact that many oral and written traditions are lost to us[61] hazardous to discard the possibility of earlier works of the same title or to conclude, on the strength of a few texts, to anteriority or posteriority; the pioneer generation of Sanskrit scholars acquainted with a smaller number of sources was often tempted to pronounce hasty judgments.

Conclusions based on the supposition that the simpler and less elaborate the execution of a ceremony the older it must have been and the earlier the text which it describes[62] are likewise open to controversy because a ritual that has developed and become elaborate in one community may have remained comparatively simple in another. It is moreover often difficult to say what has, in Vedic antiquity, been the simplest form of a definite ritual. Similarly, if rites, religious concepts and practices, social customs developed simultaneously and by the same gradual processes everywhere such oft discussed peculiarities as the fulfilment of certain ritual duties by the *adhvaryu* (and not by the sacrificer), the choice between beer *(surā)* and cups of milk at the *sautrāmaṇī* sacrifice (instead of the obligatory *surā*), the use of the term "sacrificial worship" *(yajña)* instead of *soma* sacrifice, evidence of the cult of or a certain preference for the great gods of Hinduism, omission of a reference to cartwrights *(rathakāra)*[63] as a social class, greater stress on caste distinctions—which become more pronounced in post-Vedic times—, special respect for the cow and the tendency

---

[57] Cf. GOPAL, op. cit., p. 72; 80 etc.

[58] Cf. GOPAL, op. cit., p. 72 on KŚS. and PGS.; PGS. 1, 18, 1: KŚS. 4, 12, 22f.; PGS. 2, 5, 41: KŚS. 25, 1, 12f.; PGS. 2, 13, 5: KŚS. 17, 2, 12; 3, 8.

[59] Cf. GOPAL, op. cit., p. 69; 90, n. 9; see e.g. KauṣGS. 2, 3, 9: Manu 2, 246; KauṣGS. 3, 7, 13: Manu 4, 119; ŚGS. 2, 16, 1: Manu 5, 41.

[60] See GONDA, V. L., p. 405. On Manu: KANE, H. Dh. I, p. 136; 152; 156; E. W. HOPKINS, in JAOS 11, 257; G. BÜHLER, The laws of Manu, S. B. E. XXV, Oxford 1886, p. XC; DERRETT, op. cit., p. 31. One should not follow T. R. CHINTAMANI, Kauṣītaki Gṛhya Sūtra, Madras 1944, p. XVII, in concluding that KauṣGS. is later than the Manusmṛti because of the above common property.

[61] The reference to the opinion of Vikhanas or Vaikhānasa in Manu 6, 21 cannot with CALAND, VaikhSmS. p. XVII, be considered an argument in favour of "Manu's acquaintance with our Vaikhānasa-sūtra". On Vikhanas etc. see GONDA, M. R. L., p. 140; 143f.

[62] Cf. SŪRYAKĀNTA, op. cit., p. 10.

[63] But the term does occur in the admittedly late (GOPAL, op. cit., p. 78) VārŚS. 1, 1, 4.

to give up meat-eating[64] could be a great help in discovering the chronological relations.[65] But literary compositions that stand at the same religious and social level are—also in post-Vedic India—not necessarily contemporary, those that reflect different beliefs and customs not always separated by a long interval. We are on fairly firm ground when we find in a work the use of betel or the Greek sequence of the planets and the days of the week named after these planets which seem to have been introduced into India in the 4th and 3rd centuries A.D.:[66] the Vaikhānasa- and Āgniveśya-Gṛhyasūtras[67] are not only for this reason to be regarded as late offshoots of this literature.

In trying to come to a decision authors have often referred to stylistic arguments. In this case also generalizations presupposing 'rectilinear' (parallel and irreversible) evolution—for instance, the more intelligible a *sūtra* the older it is[68] (but notice also: the Gobhila-Gṛhyasūtra seems to belong to the earlier phase of the period because "its style is, in certain passages, very diffuse and discursive");[69] a more terse or laconic style points to a later date;[70] likewise a more systematic arrangement of for instance the *paribhāṣās*;[71] a more correct arrangement of the subject-matter in general and a greater 'economy of words';[72]

---

[64] See KASHIKAR, S. Ś., p. 157 and S. Bh., p. XCI; S. Ś., p. 159 (cf. MŚS. 5, 2, 11, 11; 15; 23: BŚS. 17, 34f.); GOPAL, op. cit., p. 70 ("*soma* sacrifices had become rare, if not obsolete"); p. 76 (cf. ĀpGS. 4, 10, 2f.: BGS. 2, 5, 6); for chapters on Viṣṇu and Śiva in BGS. see HARTING, op. cit., p. XX, for VaikhSmS. GONDA, R. I. I, p. 217; GOPAL, op. cit., p. 71 (but at ŚGS. 1, 14, 13ff. mention is made of the traditional classes, not of castes; similarly at PGS. 1, 4, 8ff.; 1, 8, 15ff.; 1, 17, 4 etc.; GOPAL, op. cit., p. 72; p. 91, n. 24); it may be noticed that the list of crafts and professions which probably were in the process of becoming castes before the close of the Vedic period in KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 49 is based on some *saṃhitās*, *brāhmaṇas* and the earliest *upaniṣads*, not on *śrauta-* and *gṛhyasūtras*; for real castes *(jāti)* see the admittedly late VaikhSmS. 10, 11—15; as to the cow: ROLLAND, R. D. V., p. 34 (cf. VārGS. 6, 22; 9, 19); SŪRYAKĀNTA, op. cit., p. 66 (cf. KGS. 2, 12, 21). For a probably irrelevant discussion on the human sacrifice (which is not actual in the ritual as it is known to us: GONDA, R. I. I, p. 173) as a chronological argument KASHIKAR, S. Ś., p. 157; 160.

[65] Variant readings and the possibility of their being the result of some historical (social, religious etc.) evolution should, as sole arguments, not weigh heavily because the compilers or copyists may have had 'unhistorical' reasons for preferring a definite term.

[66] Cf. CALAND, VaikhSmS., p. XV; GOPAL, op. cit., p. 79; 80.

[67] Cf. VaikhSmS. 4, 13f.; ĀgnGS. 2, 4, 10: 73, 6; 3, 3, 1: 131, 13; 132, 4; 2, 4, 11.

[68] WEBER, I. L. ²p. 17; F. KNAUER, Das Gobhilagṛhyasūtra, II, Dorpat 1886, p. 51.

[69] GOPAL, op. cit., p. 81 subjectively referring to GGS. 1, 3, 14ff.; 1, 4, 8ff.; 1, 4, 27ff.; 1, 6, 1ff.

[70] See GOPAL, op. cit., p. 69; 71 and 81 on the KhGS.: "little more than an abridged edition of the GGS." on which it is indeed based (OLDENBERG, in S. B. E. XXIX, p. 371).

[71] For the *paribhāṣāsūtras* see ch. II, section 4. KASHIKAR's argument (S. Ś., p. 153; S. Bh., p. XCII) concerning this point fails to convince me. The very concept of *paribhāṣā* may have been subject to a particular evolution (see also RENOU, Écoles, p. 172).

[72] OLDENBERG in arguing the posteriority of KhG. to GGS. (S. B. E. XXIX,

the occurrence of intercalated questions (why?, whence?) is a stylistic device of early literature[73]—should in every single case demand proof and corroboration. Yet, the tendency to abridgment may be admitted as a criterion to determine the relative chronology, for instance in the case of Āpastamba's Śrautasūtra as compared with Bhāradvāja's and the latter's as compared with Baudhāyana's.[74] Considerations of both style and subject-matter can however settle the matter in cases such as the relative positions of Lāṭyāyana,[75]—who belongs to the older authorities—and Kātyāyana[76]—who, because of his precise style, conformity to his basic texts and the harmonious arrangement of his subject-matter is regarded as later[77]—and corroborate the tradition with regard to the *sūtras* of the Black Yajurveda. A weighty argument is resemblance in style to the mode of expression that is characteristic of the *brāhmaṇas*, especially in Baudhāyana.[78] According to Mahādeva's modern commentary, called Vaijayantī, on the Satyāṣāḍha-Śrautasūtra (Introduction, st. 7ff.)[79] Baudhāyana was the first to compose a set of *sūtras* connected with the Black Yajurveda;[80] he was, in this order, succeeded by Bharadvāja, Āpastamba, Hiraṇyakeśin,[81] Vādhūla and Vaikhānasa. As far as can be concluded from the style of these works, their structure and the presentation of their contents[82] this order is in the main correct except for the position of the Vādhūla-Sūtra which has not yet been cleared up.[83] It is highly probable that it dates back to an earlier period than Āpastamba's compendium.[84]

---

p. 372; see also HOPKINS, in C. H. I. I, p. 229). For DŚS. (cf. also RENOU, Écoles, p. 103) being "much younger than LŚS.": PARPOLA, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 34.

[73] KASHIKAR, S. Bh. I, p. XCII.

[74] KASHIKAR, S. Bh. I, 1. cit.; PANSE, in VIJ 1, p. 287; cf. also KANGLE, op. cit., p. 423; 424.

[75] GOPAL, op. cit., p. 80.

[76] For the problem of his identity etc. see K. P. SINGH, A critical study of the Kātyāyana-Śrauta-sūtra, Varanasi 1969, p. 5 and p. 529 below.

[77] See e.g. RENOU, Écoles, p. 183; KASHIKAR, S. Ś., p. 159 (otherwise K. MYLIUS, in ZMR 51, p. 248).

[78] But also in certain passages of ĀśvGS. (3, 3, 1—4; 4, 4, 2—8).

[79] Compare also BGS. 3, 9, 6; BDhŚ. 2, 5, 9, 14; BÜHLER, The sacred laws of the Āryas, I, p. XVI; CALAND, in AO (Lugd.) 2, p. 143; KEITH, V. B. Y. S., p. XLV; RENOU, Écoles, p. 171; 173.

[80] As to the Baudhāyana corpus, whereas the Śrautasūtra—which is closely allied to the Brāhmaṇa—dates no doubt further back than the other sūtras of the Taittirīyas, the additional portions of the Gṛhyasūtra are, as already stated, much later. The Gṛhyasūtra itself however precedes those of Bhāradvāja, Āpastamba and Hiraṇyakeśin which also follow in this chronological sequence. See M. WINTERNITZ, Das altindische Hochzeitsrituell, Denkschriften Akad. Wien 40 (Vienna Acad.), 1892, p. 5.

[81] In the *tarpaṇa* lists (see above) the order is Baudhāyana, Āpastamba, Hiraṇyakeśin.

[82] GARBE, op. cit. III, p. XVII; CALAND, Über . . . Baudhāyana, p. 2, 10 etc.; HARTING, op. cit., p. XV; KASHIKAR, in JGJRI 15, p. 157f. and S. Ś., p. 43 etc.; GOPAL, op. cit., p. 73.

[83] See CALAND, op. cit.; M. WITZEL, in SII 1 (1975), p. 94.

[84] See chapter II, 5 below.

So much for a more detailed argument; I now recapitulate: while attempts to classify the whole ritual (and social) *sūtra* literature chronologically into four or three groups[85] are premature, the relative chronology of the main *sūtras* of the Black Yajurveda may be regarded as established,[86] Lāṭyāyana and Mānava[87] are generally included among the older *śrauta* works, sometimes also Jaiminīya;[88] Śāṅkhāyana is now assigned to a somewhat earlier, now to a somewhat later date than Āśvalāyana who, like Kātyāyana, does not belong to the oldest authorities;[89] the Khādira-Gṛhyasūtra depends on Gobhila's domestic manual which belongs to a comparatively early period; the Pāraskara-Gṛhya-sūtra is posterior to the Kātyāyana-Śrautasūtra; that Āgniveśya and Vaikhā-nasa are very recent is generally admitted.

Among the arguments adduced to prove the antiquity of the Śrautasūtras of Baudhāyana and Lāṭyāyana[90] has been a peculiarity which they have in common with the *brāhmaṇas*, viz. the practice of mentioning—as authoritative or as rejectable—the statements made and the rites or customs observed by individual teachers and in doing so the tendency to distinguish these authorities by their names.[91] The later *sūtrakāras* as a rule abandoned this practice: they usually referred to existing 'literature' or other authorities without mentioning their names. Instead they preferred the anonymous "some" *(eke)*.[92] Thus Āpastamba, after stating that a rice-dish should be prepared for the officiants adds, ĀpŚS. 3, 4, 13, that "in the opinion of some (authorities) it should be cooked in milk" *(kṣīre bhavatīty eke)*.[93] Instead of this favourite expression one can also find "There is another (view)", e.g. BhŚS. 7, 2, 16:

> "There is another (view), viz. that in the animal sacrifice (the sacrificer) should not receive the fire (that means, should not recite the verses beginning with 'I receive Agni')" *(na paśviṣṭyām agniṃ gṛhṇīyād ity aparam)*.[94]

---

[85] Gopal, op. cit., p. 84; Kashikar, S. Ś., p. 161.

[86] According to W. Caland, The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa in the Kāṇvīya recension, I, Lahore 1926, p. 99 the older parts of the Baudhāyana corpus are prior to the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa.

[87] See e.g. Keith, V. B. Y. S., p. XLVI. According to Parpola, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 42 JŚS. is "very old" (denied by Gopal, V. K. I., p. 81).

[88] Gaastra, B. K. V. R., p. XIII.

[89] See also Renou, Écoles, p. 36.

[90] Weber, I. L., ²p. 84. In Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der kgl. Bibliothek in Berlin, V, II, 1 (Berlin 1886), p. 26f. the same author has published a complete index to the names etc. in the LŚS. See also Weber, I. S. I, p. 25; IV, p. 371.

[91] This is not to conclude that in olden times there were more differences of opinion than afterwards.

[92] LŚS. refers ca. 470 times to *ācāryāḥ* or *eke* on about 240 subjects. KŚS., on the other hand, mentions only a few teachers by name.

[93] A few more places are ĀpŚS. 1, 1, 7; 1, 8, 6; 2, 3, 8; 3, 9, 5; 6; BhŚS. 1, 3, 3; 3, 4, 10; 8, 4, 16; 8, 23, 12; 9, 13, 8; 11, 2, 11; ĀśvŚS. 2, 2, 1; KŚS. 4, 13, 7; ĀśvGS. 1, 8, 11; PGS. 1, 2, 5; JGS. 1, 17.

[94] See also BhŚS. 4, 3, 4; 11, 6, 9; 11, 7, 2 etc.

Not infrequently mention is made of more than one **different opinion, for instance** BhŚS. 3, 13, 10:

"Some (authorities) hand down this (sacrifice) as regular, others as optional" *(tam etaṃ nityavad eke samāmananti, kāmyavad eke)*.[95]

Or the authors allude to the ritual prescripts or customs of their predecessors or colleagues as 'optional' or 'alternative' *(vikalpa)*.[96]

Yet, names of authorities do occur in the later *sūtras*. Āśvalāyana, ŚS. 1, 2, 5, mentions the name of Kautsa[97] in connexion with the question of the order of the elements of a formula, and at 3, 6, 6; 3, 11, 18 etc. he keeps his readers informed of the opinion of Gāṇagāri; the author of BGPS. 1, 9, 12ff. records no less than four different opinions—ascribed to Bodhāyana, Śālīki, Aupamanyava and Aupamanyavīputra—on the sacrificial matter to be offered on a certain occasion.[98]

Cases are, it is true, not absent in which an author subscribes to the views of another teacher or expresses the intention to repeat his words—the author of GGSPar. 1, 1 is going to enunciate the tenets of one Padmayoni on the *saṃskāras*—but polemics seem to be a no less frequent occasion for citing authorities: ĀśvŚS. 2, 6, 16ff. engages in controversy with Gāṇagāri, Taulvali and Gautama on the problem as to which ascendants should receive certain oblations.

From these very numerous references it appears, first that even Baudhāyana could look back upon many predecessors—his work refers to more than twenty ritualists[99]—, secondly that there have existed numbers of differences of opinion ranging from trivialities to fundamental deviations from the practices recommended by the author; deviations which however were regarded as worth mentioning because they could furnish those who chose to perform definite ritual acts otherwise with indispensable information on the validity or admissibility of their ways of acting.[100] Whereas Baudhāyana objects to using for

[95] See also BhŚS. 2, 18, 6; 3, 13, 10; ĀpŚS. 1, 2, 6; 2, 41; for four different opinions: BhŚS. 1, 3, 15—18. Or the formula is *ekam . . . aparam*: BhŚS. 2, 3, 2; 12; 5, 3, 23; 5, 18, 3; 8, 23, 4; 10, 11, 9 etc.

[96] See e.g. ĀśvŚS. 1, 12, 5; 2, 2, 12; 3, 2, 14; LŚS. 8, 12, 5; 9, 11, 5; JGS. 1, 17.

[97] Cf. GONDA, V. L., p. 46. For Śaunaka see ĀśvGS. 4, 7, 16 (there were several persons of this name; see also n. 15 above). For the ritual teachers cited in ĀśvŚS. see P. D. NAVATHE, in JUPHS 27 (1968), p. 137.

[98] Cf. also BGPS. 1, 10, 2f. These names occur also in BŚS.; Śālīki, who is often quoted, must have been a personage of repute; for Aupamanyava see also JGS. 1, 14 where he belongs to a group of thirteen old teachers who are to be gratified with a libation of water, the first of them being Talavakāra, i.e. Jaimini, the reputed founder of the school (GONDA, V. L., p. 319).

[99] They are enumerated by CALAND, Über . . . Baudhāyana, p. 35. Part of these persons are not known from other sources. Compare also the Indices at the end of his edition of BŚS., vol. III, Calcutta 1913. In the Baudhāyana corpus the different opinions are collected in the so-called *dvaidhasūtra* (ch. XX—XXIII).

[100] See e.g. different opinions of Śālīki and others in Śrautakośa I, Engl. section 1, p. 5; 88; 89; 94ff.

ritual purposes wood of a tree that had been struck by lightning, Śālīki allows it; in his chapters on the full and new moon sacrifices Bhāradvāja prescribes the order for partaking of food, adding fuel to the sacred fires, taking a vow, but Āpastamba mentions also two other orders; Lāṭyāyana puts on record the different positions taken up by Gautama, Dhānañjaya and Śāṇḍilya[101] in the matter of the divine power of definite chants.[102] In many cases it can be shown that the ritualists quoted are posterior to the *brāhmaṇas* because their view represents a definite exegesis of the wording of these texts.[103] It hardly needs saying that these references are not always in harmony with one another. There are, for instance, cases in which the same views are ascribed to one teacher by Lāṭyāyana and to another by Śāṅkhāyana[104] or in which two works ascribe two different opinions to different teachers.[105] There are, interestingly enough, striking discrepancies between the quotations in Lāṭyāyana and Drāhyāyaṇa who follows the former very closely,[106] and even contradictory statements in the latter.[107]

In the third place, these constant references to the opinions of earlier—and not infrequently unknown or obscure—sources, whether they are mentioned by name or indefinitely cited as "some", show that the extant *sūtras* are but part of a mass of oral and written tradition. A much more thorough and comprehensive study of all relevant places in the *sūtras* and the allied literature—a long neglected subject of study[108]—will no doubt deepen our insight into the interdependence of the texts[109] and the authorities quoted, the history of ideas and the development of the ritual theories and practices; throw light upon chronological problems and trends of thought that had remained in comparative obscurity; allow us to form a somewhat clearer idea of the activities of the brahmins who had prominently contributed to the development of the ritual and of those ritual schools that have not left writings of their own and to place the peculiarities and significance of the treatises that have survived in stronger relief. One of the results of the pertinent researches may be mentioned:

---

[101] For Śāṇḍilya see GONDA, V. L., p. 337; 353; M. R. L., p. 17ff. etc.

[102] BŚS. 20, 16: 33, 9; BhŚS. 4, 3, 2; ĀpŚS. 4, 2, 8; LŚS. 7, 13, 1f.

[103] Cf. LŚS. 8, 2, 10—12; DŚS. 22, 2, 10—12: PB. 16, 6, 8f.; LŚS. 8, 6, 7—27; DŚS. 23, 1, 17—23, 2, 19: PB. 17, 1, 14—17.

[104] For details see PARPOLA, Ś. L. D., p. 90. See LŚS. 1, 1, 25 (Dhānañjayya; ŚŚS. 3, 20, 19 Jātūkarṇya).

[105] See BhGS. 1, 20: HGS. 1, 25, 3f. and CALAND, Über . . . Baudhāyana, p. 5.

[106] A. PARPOLA, On the quotations of ritualistic teachers in the Śrautasūtras of Lāṭyāyana and Drāhyāyana, in Raghu Vira Memorial Volume, ed. D. Sinor, New Delhi 1968, p. 69.

[107] Cf. e.g. LŚS. 3, 1, 4f. (cf. PB. 12, 13, 26): DŚS. 7, 1, 4f.

[108] But see PARPOLA, On the quotations . . . (n. 106 above) and Ś. L. D., p. 89.

[109] At twenty-two of the more than two hundred places where ĀpŚS. mentions the views of *eke*, these views are identical with those expressed in BhŚS.; it is therefore probable that Āpastamba refers to Bhāradvāja (KASHIKAR, S. Bh., p. LXXXIII; S. Ś., p. 58).

from a comparison of the views on different points of two frequently—and almost always concurrently—cited authorities on the Taittirīya practices,[110] Āśmarathya and Ālekhana, it has appeared "that in most cases the former represents a strictly traditional ritual, while the latter prescribes a form of ritual which is less complicated and more convenient".[111] "This is exactly the relation of the two most frequently quoted teachers of the Lāṭyāyana-Śrauta-sūtra, Śāṇḍilya and Dhānañjaya",[112] and probably also of other teachers.

The *sūtrakāras* do not only mention colleagues and predecessors, they very often quote or refer to passages from *brāhmaṇas*. For instance, ĀpŚS. 3, 6, 10:

> "It has been said (in the Brāhmaṇa and must be observed in this connexion), 'He should not tear it to pieces'"; cf. TS. 2, 6, 5, 3ff. . . . "He does not break off (the edges of the so-called *prastara* bundle)";

BGŚS. 4, 8, 1:

> "Now it is found (in the Brāhmaṇa), 'In the beginning the waters were this . . .'", which is not exactly identical with TB. 1, 1, 3, 5f.;

ĀgnGS. 2, 5, 5:

> after a long quotation which is identical with TS. 3, 4, 4 "The gods and the *asuras* were in conflict. Indra had recourse to Prajāpati . . ." the text reads as follows: "As to this there is a *brāhmaṇa* (TS. 3, 4, 6, 1) 'If he is desirous of prospering with a rite, he should offer them (viz. the offering mentioned) . . .'"[113]

The *sūtras* do not only quote their own *brāhmaṇas* but also *brāhmaṇas* of other *śākhās* among them many that are no longer extant.[114] To mention only a few instances, Baudhāyana[115] quotes the Chandoga (i.e. the Pañcaviṃśa and Ṣaḍviṃśa) as well as the Paiṅgalāyani, Chāgaleya, and Maitrāyaṇīya Brāhmaṇas; Āpastamba cites practically unknown works such as the Kaṅkati, Kālabavin, Paiṅgāyanin, Śāṭyāyani (Śāṭyāyanaka) and Śailālin Brāhmaṇas,

---

[110] See e.g. CALAND, Über . . . Baudhāyana, p. 5; GARBE, ĀpŚS. III, p. XXX. In BhŚS. and ĀpŚS. their names occur 65 times.

[111] C. G. KASHIKAR, The ritual teachers, Āśmarathya and Ālekhana, in JAS Bombay 36—37 (1961—62, published in 1964), p. 32 and S. Bh. I, p. LXVII who is of the opinion that the influence exerted by Ālekhana, who was a Bhārgava (member of the Bhṛgu family), upon the Taittirīyas as well as Āśvalāyana proves the continued prominence of that family. The author's solution of the problem as to how the views of much earlier authorities, if not recorded in written form, have been known to these *sūtrakāras*—viz. we have to do with family rather than personal names—is not wholly convincing.—Cf. e.g. BhŚS. 9, 6, 13; 9, 16, 9; 9, 17, 10; ĀpŚS. 9, 10, 12 (with Caland's note). Whereas BŚS. usually takes no sides, ĀpŚS. often adopted Ālekhana's views.

[112] PARPOLA, Ś. L. D., p. 90.

[113] For other particulars see chapter VI. See e.g. also BŚS. 14, 23: 192, 12: TB. 1, 4, 3, 3; 14, 24: 196, 17: TB. 1, 4, 4, 1 etc. etc.; ĀpGS. 3, 8, 12.

[114] See e.g. also CALAND, in AO 1, p. 6.

[115] See CALAND, Über . . . Baudhāyana, p. 40; BŚS. 2, 2: 35, 20; 2, 7: 45, 1; 23, 5: 156, 2; 30, 8: 401, 11.

the Bhāllavika and Pāliṅgāyanika.[116] Elsewhere reference is made to an undefined *śruti* text.[117]

Conclusions concerning the original home of the 'authors', the regions in which the several schools came to establish themselves or where their doctrines were disseminated can be drawn from internal evidence, information derivable from commentaries, epigraphic records, the provenance of manuscripts, traditions prevailing among learned brahmins and the actual state of affairs in India. A point of no mean interest which is awaiting closer investigation concerns the mutual influence of the Vedic schools and the part played by their geographical location in this complicated process.[118] From cumulative evidence it appears that the Āśvalāyanas may have had their home in Āryavarta (the region between the Himālayas and the Vindhyas),[119] came to inhabit also the region bounded by the rivers Tuṅgā, Kṛṣṇā and Godāvarī and extending to the Āndhra country and were in later times widely dispersed: in Bengal, Jodhpur and especially in the South and in all probability in many other parts of the subcontinent. The other Ṛgvedins, the followers of Śāṅkhāyana, remaining far behind in esteem and following, lived in Kanauj and Mālva, in modern times only in Gujarat and Rajasthan.[120] The Jaiminīyas, now a very rare school surviving in Kerala and Tamilnadu,[121] seem to have belonged mainly to the South.[122] Nowadays there are Rāṇāyanīyas in Mathurā[123] and probably in Āndhra, but the former home of the nearly related Kauthumas is specially connected with Gujarat.[124] Numerous, but not too reliable geographical references in Lāṭyāyana point to the same north-western origin.[125] The Khādira-Gṛhyasūtra, which belongs to the Drāhyāyaṇa school, is a specimen of a southern domestic manual.

---

[116] See A. B. KEITH, in JRAS 1915, p. 498; ĀpŚS. 14, 20, 4 (cf. Caland's note); 20, 9, 9; 5, 14, 18; 5, 29, 4; 5, 23, 3 (cf. Caland's note and BhGS. 3, 18); 10, 12, 13 (this name occurs also elsewhere); 6, 4, 7; 21, 16, 15; 21, 23, 5 (see Caland's note). For lost *brāhmaṇas* see GONDA, V. L., p. 349; 356.

[117] See e.g. ĀpŚS. 6, 12, 3; 6, 15, 6 *(śrutaṃ hi tat)*; 6, 23; PGS. 1, 2, 6; 1, 8, 13.

[118] This influence has more than once (for instance by RENOU, Écoles, p. 15) been discussed without any reference to geographical relations. See PARPOLA, Ś. L. D., p. 42.

[119] For geographical references (Yamunā etc.) see ĀśvŚS. 12, 6, 2; 27; 28.

[120] For references see GONDA, V. L., p. 32; for Gujarat see also the Cāraṇavyūha-bhāṣya (quoting a work entitled Mahārṇava), st. 5 (quoted for instance by BÜHLER, in S. B. E. II, p. XXXIII) *uttare gurjare deśe ... kauṣītakī brāhmaṇaṃ ca śākhā śāṅkhāyanī sthitā*. See also GOPAL, I. V. K., p. 93.

[121] These traditions "represent two separate branches that have stayed apart in their nucleus areas well over a thousand years" (PARPOLA, L. S. J. S., p. 23).

[122] Cf. also W. CALAND, The Jaiminigṛhyasūtra, Lahore 1922, p. XI; PARPOLA, Ś. L. D., p. 103.

[123] V. RAGHAVAN, Present position of Vedic chanting and its future, Bull. Inst. of Traditional Cultures (Madras) 1957, p. 18. For further information and literature: GONDA, V. L., p. 319; PARPOLA, L. S. J. S.

[124] Cf. also RENOU, Écoles, p. 127.

[125] See PARPOLA, Ś. L. D., I, 1., p. 29, also for the possibly north-western origin of the name (Lāṭa is Gujarat).

Whereas the Kaṭha-Kapiṣṭhalas were scattered in the Punjab and Kashmir, the Maitrāyaṇīyas belonged to Gujarat and the Mānavas, one of their schools, seem to have been productive in the Punjab; the followers of the other school, the Vārāhas, have, in a few families, survived in Mahārāṣṭra.[126] The Taittirīyas must have been widespread in the South where the followers of their main schools lived for a fairly long time. Bühler and others were inclined to locate the home of Baudhāyana in the Āndhra country, *inter alia* because of his repeated references to sea voyages[127] and that of Āpastamba, on the authority of the Mahārṇava[128] and a reference to a custom of the Northerners in the Dharma work (2, 7, 17, 17), in the same region.[129] Traditions, epigraphic and other information[130] on the historical dwelling-places do not however prove the earliest seats of all Taittirīya schools to have been in the South.[131] If the names of the Ganges and the Yamunā in *gṛhyasūtras*[132] are no conclusive proof, geographical references in *dharma* texts are no indication of the compilers' acquaintance with these various regions.[133] The author of the Hiraṇyakeśi-Gṛhyasūtra gives no evidence of knowledge of the South.[134] On the strength of several references to peoples of the North and of Janaka, king of Videha, in the texts of the Vādhūla school[135] there is a strong presumption that these Taittirīyas, like others, originated in Northern or North-Eastern India. Kātyāyana is assumed to have lived in the north-eastern region of India.

[126] See KASHIKAR, S. Bh. I, p. XCVI and in Vol. Kavirāj, p. 14.

[127] BÜHLER, in S. B. E. XIV, p. XLI; cf. BDhŚ. 1, 1, 2, 4; 2, 1, 2, 2. See also KANE, H. Dh. I, p. 27.

[128] See n. 120 above.

[129] BÜHLER, in S. B. E. II, p. XXXIII; in the North according to R. GOPAL, in 18 AIOC, SP (1955), p. 15.

[130] See also PARPOLA, Ś. L. D., p. 43.

[131] Cf. CALAND, in GGA 1898, p. 955; RENOU, in Siddheswar Varma Presentation Volume, Hoshiarpur 1950, p. 219; GOPAL, I. V. K. p. 91 (drawing attention to some 'northern' words in ĀpŚS. 15, 3, 12 *(ghoṭa)*; 15, 19, 4 *(bhayeḍaka)*; not all arguments are strong); KASHIKAR, S. Ś., p. 162; S. Bh. I, p. XCV.

[132] HGS. 2, 1, 3; BhGS. 1, 21 (the commentator substituting names of southern rivers); cf. MP. 2, 11, 13; BGS. 1, 10, 11; PGS. 1, 15, 8.

[133] Compare also the ethnic names in BŚS. 2, 5; 18, 13 (CALAND, Über ... Baudhāyana, p. 35), among them the Gāndhāras in the north-west and the Kaliṅgas in the south-east of India.

[134] Compare KANE, H. Dh. I, p. 47.

[135] See the fragments published by CALAND in AO 4, p. 180; 202; 1, p. 6; 4, p. 35; and M. WITZEL, in SII 1, p. 93.

Chapter II

THE ŚRAUTASŪTRAS

1. General introduction. The śrautasūtras of the Yajurveda

The *śrautasūtras*[1] are manuals compiled for a practical purpose, viz. giving directions to those who officiated at the several solemn sacrificial rites that were performed or recommended in Vedic times. Their authors provide us with many detailed and meticulously accurate descriptions of these ceremonies.[2] These works are closely connected with the older Vedic literature and in a particular way[3] related to and based on the *brāhmaṇas* which they often quote and which they sometimes follow in their vocabulary and phraseology. They incorporate numberless *mantras* directly or indirectly taken from the Vedic *saṃhitās.*[4] They belong without exception to one of the four Vedas; there are no hybrid *sūtras.*

Interestingly enough, the Vedic rituals were already at an early date made to conform to a systematic arrangement. Not only the rites belonging to the three classes of (1) *darśapūrṇamāsau* and the other *iṣṭis*, (2) the more elaborate animal sacrifices following the model set by the offering of an animal to Agni and Soma and (3) the *soma* ceremonies—modifications *(vikṛti)* of the *agniṣṭoma* including also the *dvādaśāha* (twelve day offering) on which the longer sacrifices *(sattra)* are based[5]—came to be grouped in accordance with their main characteristics, originally separate rituals were united and under the influence of an advancing scholasticism and the typically Indian bent for classification included in a great system. Notwithstanding the considerable losses of ritualistic literature[6] the tradition of the Vedic ritual practices as such has been preserved

[1] Sometimes also *vaitānikasūtras* "*sūtras* relative to (the rites with) the three sacred fires".

[2] For a survey see e.g. Hillebrandt, Ritualliteratur, p. 97; Keith, R. Ph. V. U., p. 313; Kane, H. Dh. II, p. 976; Renou(-Filliozat), I. C. I, p. 345; Gonda, R. I. I, p. 138.

[3] For details see section 2 below.

[4] Compare Gonda, V. I., p. 30.

[5] See e.g. Mādhava's (Sāyaṇa's) commentary on TS., Introduction, Bibl. Indica, I, Calcutta 1860, p. 8f.

[6] According to a later text, Ānanda-Saṃhitā (see Gonda, Medieval religious literature in Sanskrit, in Vol. II of this History, p. 144), there were fifteen *sūtras* of the Yajurveda (Bodhāyanīya, Śāṇḍilya, Āgastya, Pañca-Kāṭhaka, Vaikhānasa, Bharadvāja, Satyāṣāḍha, Śākala, Mādhyaṃdina, Kauṇḍinya, Lokākṣita, Kusīdaka, Kātyāyana, Vādhūla, Āgniveśyaka); we possess nine and some fragments of a tenth

in a fairly complete form in those *śrautasūtras* that have survived, the commentaries composed to explain them and the other allied writings. As a domain of philological and religious study this literature is often unduly neglected, but its significance as a source for the history of religion in general and of ritualism in particular cannot be overrated.

The several *śrautasūtras* owe their origin to the endeavour of the ritualists who adhered to one of the so-called branches *(śākhā)* or traditions of the Veda[7] and belong therefore, traditionally as well as in accordance with their contents, to one of the *saṃhitās*. Thus the Śrautasūtras of Āśvalāyana and Śāṅkhāyana belong to the Ṛgveda; this means that they describe the *hautra*[8] in a systematic form. The principal Śrautasūtras of the Sāmaveda are those of Lāṭyāyana and Drāhyāyana, the former affiliated to the Kauthuma-śākhā, the latter to the Rāṇāyanīya recension. Whereas the Kātyāyana-Śrautasūtra is held to belong to both recensions of the Vājasaneya-Saṃhitā (White Yajurveda),[9] the Black Yajurveda is represented in the *śrauta* literature by six Taittirīya treatises, named after the founders of the same number of schools, Baudhāyana, Bhāradvāja, Āpastamba, Satyāṣāḍha-Hiraṇyakeśin, Vaikhānasa and Vādhūla. To the Maitrāyaṇī recension belong two Śrautasūtras, the Mānava and the Vārāha. Of the *sūtra* of the Kāṭhakas (Kāṭhaka-Śrautasūtra) only a few fragments are available at present.[10] The affiliation of these *sūtras* with definite recensions of the Yajurveda is especially clear from the quotations contained in them: in most cases the *mantras* employed in them are taken from the *saṃhitās* and *brāhmaṇas* to which they belong.

The *sūtras* belonging to the Yajurveda will in the following pages be the centre of interest, not only because this Veda provides the fundamentals of the rituals[11] but also because its *śrautasūtras* tended to become a sort of ritualistic encyclopaedias rather than aide-mémoires as the *śrautasūtras* of the other Vedas have been called,[12] and finally because it most probably was in yajurvedic circles that this genre of literature originated and the foundations were laid of the literary development of Vedic religion and ritualism in general.[13]

There can be no doubt that the yajurvedic *śrautasūtras*—which "bear a strong family likeness"[14]—followed, in principle and in some main points, the

(see W. Caland, On the sacred books of the Vaikhānasas, Amsterdam Acad. 1928, p. 10; Renou, Écoles, p. 173).

[7] See also L. Renou, Les écoles védiques et la formation du Veda, Paris 1947.

[8] See above, chapter I, 1.

[9] See Gonda, V. L., p. 327; 337.

[10] The Vaitāna-Sūtra belonging to the Atharvaveda must in this connexion be left out of consideration.

[11] Compare Sāyaṇa in his introduction to the Taittirīya-Saṃhitā, B. I. ed. I, p. 9: "the Yajurveda represents the wall, the two other Vedas the painting". For the literature on the Yajurveda in general see N. Tsuji, Existent Yajurveda literature (in Japanese), Tokyo 1970.

[12] Renou, Écoles, p. 171.

[13] Gonda, V. L., p. 30.

[14] A. Hillebrandt, The Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, I, Calcutta 1888, Preface, p. X.

order of the *śruti* and of the *mantra* collections. This fact is for instance explicitly stated in the commentator's introductory notes on many chapters of Kātyāyana's Śrautasūtra[15] which account also for deviations from that order, due for instance to the influence of another *śākhā* or to the desire to combine what is more closely related. Now, it may be recalled[16] that the Taittirīyas, arranging and systematizing their traditions at an early date, distributed their *saṃhitā* and *brāhmaṇa* material over the Saṃhitā proper, the Brāhmaṇa and the Āraṇyaka, all three collections including *mantra* and *brāhmaṇa* portions. A survey of the contents of these collections is given in a comparatively late but undatable work of the *pariśiṣṭa* type of literature, the Kāṇḍānukramaṇika "Index of the divisions".[17] The whole division as explained by the commentator runs—in an abbreviated form—as follows:[18] the offerings belonging to the *darśapūrṇamāsau*;[19] the *soma* sacrifice; *agnyādhāna*; *punarādheya*; the reverence of the fire *(agnyupasthāna)*; the part of the sacrificer in the *iṣṭis* (*darśapūrṇamāsau* etc.); *vājapeya*; *rājasūya*; the special animal sacrifices performed for some particular object *(kāmyāḥ paśavaḥ)*; the special *iṣṭis (kāmyā iṣṭayaḥ)*; the *brāhmaṇa* belonging to the full and new moon rites; the supplement to the *soma* sacrifice; *agnicayana*; the exposition of the *soma* sacrifice; the *sattras*; *aśvamedha*; *pravargya*; *agnihotra* and some other rituals including the *kaukilī sautrāmaṇī*.[20] From this survey it may appear that the author of the Kāṇḍānukrama knew the Taittirīya-Saṃhitā practically in its present form, but hardly in the exact order of the text as it stands. There are, however, certain important exceptions or—what seems more probable—some intentional deviations[21] due to the desire to collect material which in the Saṃhitā is scattered over several chapters; to make good some serious defects of the Saṃhitā, among them the omission of the *agnyādhāna*; and to insert at their proper place those parts of the two other works, the Brāhmaṇa and the Āraṇyaka, which should complete

[15] See e.g. ch. 2 *uktāḥ paribhāṣāḥ. idānīṃ śrutikramaṃ mantrakramaṃ cānusarann ācāryaḥ prathamaṃ paurṇamāseṣṭim upadidikṣus . . . āha*; 5 *ācāryeṇa śrutimantrapāṭhakrameṇa paurṇamāsādīny agnihotrāntāni karmāṇy uktāni. idānīṃ śrutipāṭhakrameṇaiva cāturmāsyāni vaktum . . . āha*, etc.; see also the notes before 4, 12, 6, 1 and 13, 1.

[16] See GONDA, V. L., p. 325.

[17] Edited by A. WEBER, I. S. III, p. 373; XII, p. 350 and in Taittirīya Saṃhitā edited by A. MAHĀDEVA ŚĀSTRI and P. K. RAṄGĀCĀRYA (Bibl. Sanskr. IV), Mysore 1894, Appendix, p. 1.

[18] For a complete survey see KEITH, V. B. Y. S., p. XXVII. For the technical terms see also n. 23 below.

[19] For the priority of position given to this ritual see e.g. also Dhūrtasvāmin on ĀpŚS. 1, 1, 1.

[20] The *sautrāmaṇī* is classified as a *haviryajña*, not a *soma* sacrifice; the *kaukilī* form is an independent offering, the *carakā sautrāmaṇī* forms part of another rite, as the *rājasūya* and the *agnicayana*.

[21] It must however be noticed that according to Kāṇḍānukrama 4, 25f. the Ātreyas—the *śākhā* of the Black Yajurveda which produced this index—took their *saṃhitā* text not directly from the founder Tittiri but through Ukha (for him see BGS. 3, 9, 6; BhGS. 3, 11).

the ritual. It is on the other hand not less evident that the six *śrautasūtras* of the Taittirīya *śākhā* that have been preserved, while agreeing with the Kāṇḍānukrama in a more coherent and concentrated presentation of the material, deviate from the order in which this index has arranged the sacrificial rites. They are unanimous in treating the *darśapūrṇamāsau, agnyādheya, agnihotra,* animal and seasonal sacrifices before the *soma* rites: hence the comprehensive name *prāksoma* "what precedes the *soma* rites" for this group of sacrifices.[22] As appears from the following table all of them deal with the *agniṣṭoma* etc. before the *agnicayana*—and in this they agree with the Maitrāyaṇīyas and the adherents of the White Yajurveda—, most of them with the latter before the *rājasūya* and *vājapeya*.[23]

---

[22] (See WEBER, I. S. V (Berlin 1862), p. 14 and the colophon of MŚS., ch. I) or *prāksaumika* (Yājñ. 1, 124). Occasionally an explanation for a definite order is provided in a *sūtra* work: ĀśvŚS. 1, 1, 3 "We shall explain the sacrifices of full and new moon first because in these the framework (*tantra*, viz. of the unbloody and animal sacrifices) has been handed down"; cf. ŚŚS. 1, 16, 1 "The sacrifices of full and new moon, which have been explained, are the model *(prakṛti)* for the unbloody *(iṣṭi)* and animal sacrifices". The *tantra* is that part of the ritual which is common to all sacrifices of the same class; the special (and hence principal) features of a definite ritual are called the *pradhāna*.

[23] For general information on the *śrauta* rites see ch. I, 1, n. 10. The Śrautakośa or Encyclopaedia of Vedic Sacrificial Ritual (see the list of abbreviated titles), published at Poona is a compendium of the Vedic solemn ritual, comprising original texts—and in a separate series ('section') English translations—dealing with the same subjects in order to provide the reader with synoptic pictures of the several rites. While the Sanskrit Section comprises the relevant portions from the Baudhāyana-Śrautasūtra and all other important texts, including *saṃhitās* and *brāhmaṇas*, the English section closely follows the order in which the ritual is treated in the other section. As to the particular rites: on the full moon and new moon sacrifices *(darśapūrṇamāsau)* A. HILLEBRANDT, Das altindische Neu- und Vollmondsopfer, Jena 1880; the preparation of the three sacred fires (*agnyādhāna* or *agnyādheya*) and their re-establishment *(punarādheya)* KEITH, R. Ph. V. U., p. 316; the fire cult *(agnihotra)* DUMONT, Agnihotra; the first-fruit sacrifice *(āgrayaṇa)* B. LINDNER, in Festgrusz Boehtlingk, p. 79; the animal sacrifice *(paśubandha)* SCHWAB, Thieropfer; the seasonal (four-month) offerings performed in spring, in the rains and in the autumn (*cāturmāsyāni*, Tertialopfer) KEITH, R. Ph. V. U., p. 321; GONDA, R. I. I, p. 146; the model form of the *soma* sacrifice, viz. the *agniṣṭoma* which is ranked as the first form of the series of *soma* sacrifices called by the generic name of *jyotiṣṭoma* CALAND-HENRY, L'agniṣṭoma; the hot-milk sacrifice inserted in the *soma* sacrifice *(pravargya)* R. GARBE, in ZDMG 34 (1880), p. 319; J. A. B. VAN BUITENEN, Poona 1968; C. G. KASHIKAR, in CASS 1 (1972), p. 1; the *ukthya* with which the *agniṣṭoma* and *atyagniṣṭoma, ṣoḍaśin, vājapeya, atirātra* and *āptoryāma* are said to constitute a series of *soma* sacrifices bearing the generic name of *jyotiṣṭoma*; the main characteristic of the *ukthya* (see KEITH, R. Ph. V. U., p. 334) lies in a larger number of *śastras* (recitations) and *stotras* (chants, hymns of praise) at the third pressing; the piling of the fireplace *(agnicayana)* which may combine with any *soma* sacrifice but is declared to be obligatory only in certain cases GONDA, R. I. I, p. 191; EGGELING, ŚB. IV, p. XIII; V, p. 1; the so-called drink of vitality *(vājapeya)* a *soma* rite of seventeen days A. WEBER, in SB Berlin 1892, p. 765; the royal consecration *(rājasūya)*, another *soma* sacrifice preceded by a long series of

Continuing this discussion I must, to begin with, observe that the above definition of the contents of the *sūtras* belonging to the Yajurveda needs some modification. Although it is true that these works deal first and foremost with the ritual for the *adhvaryu* and his assistants (the *ādhvaryava(m)*) the *sūtras* attributed to Āpastamba, Hiraṇyakeśin and Mānava pay also attention to the functions of the *hotar cum suis (hautra(m))*, these three as well as the *sūtras* of Baudhāyana and Bhāradvāja also to the task of the sacrificer *(yājamāna(m))*: the *hotar*, *adhvaryu*, *udgātar* and *yajamāna* are free to discharge the duties of other priests.[24] Besides, most of the *sūtras* include also sections on the functions of the priest called *brahman*, who, being seated near the south side of the sacrificial ground, is engaged in supervision of the ritual and has to repair every flaw caused by the other priests.[25] The fact that the *yajamāna*, who could be an adherent of any school, and, at least in the older period, the *brahman*—not

preparatory rites J. C. HEESTERMAN, The ancient Indian royal consecration, Thesis Utrecht 1957 (The Hague 1957); the *sautrāmaṇī* which is not a *soma* sacrifice but, though classified by the *sūtras* as a simple oblation of clarified butter etc. *(havir-yajña)*, is characterized by an offering of a sort of beer *(surā)* K. RÖNNOW, in MO 22, p. 153; the simple sacrifices *(iṣṭi)*, contrasted to animal and *soma* sacrifices KEITH, R. Ph. V. U., p. 313 etc.; many *iṣṭis* are performed 'from interested motives' i.e. for the fulfilment of special desires, for which see W. CALAND, Over de 'wensch-offers', Amsterdam Acad. 1898; Altindische Zauberei (Darstellung der altindischen 'Wunschopfer'), Amsterdam Acad. 1908; for the horse-sacrifice *(aśvamedha)* see P. E. DUMONT, L'aśvamedha, Louvain 1927; for the twelve-day offering *(dvāda-śāha)* which is the model of all so-called "(sacrificial) sessions" *(sattra)*, i.e. all *soma* rites with more than twelve pressing days HILLEBRANDT, Ritualliteratur, p. 154; A. B. KEITH, Rigveda Brāhmaṇas, Cambridge Mass. 1920, p. 55; the *sattra* of one year's duration called "the way of the cows" *(gavām ayana)* HILLEBRANDT, Rit., p. 157; KEITH, R. Ph. V. U., p. 350; LOKESH CHANDRA, Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa 2, 1—80 (Gavām ayana), Thesis Utrecht 1950 (Nagpur 1950); the variety of *soma* ritual which with a nocturnal continuation lasted through the night *(atirātra)* KEITH, R. Ph. V. U., p. 335; the *soma* sacrifices of one day's duration *(ekāha)* HILLEBRANDT, Rit., p. 138; KEITH, R. Ph. V. U., p. 336; the *soma* sacrifices with more than one and not more than twelve pressing days *(ahīna)* HILLEBRANDT, Rit., p. 147; KEITH, R. Ph. V. U., p. 348; the 'sessions' *(sattra)*, *soma* sacrifices with more than twelve pressing days which differ from other *soma* rites in requiring the consecration *(dīkṣā)* of all the performers; expiations of errors some of which are very elaborate *(prāyaścitta)* HILLEBRANDT, Rit., p. 166; KEITH, R. Ph. V. U., p. 356.—As to the distribution of the subject-matter over chapters and sections it will be clear from the table and what will be said in the following pages that a sacrifice dealt with in a separate chapter in one work may occupy a few sections in another.—The order in which the *sūtras* of the Taittirīyas appear in the table is with the exception of Vādhūla the traditional one; see p. 482 above. For the table see p. 494.

[24] Cf. e.g. BŚS. 27, 6; ŚŚS. 7, 7, 4ff.; and see CALAND, in WZKM 14, p. 118; RENOU, Écoles, p. 9; 10. In this respect TS. 1, 6; 2, 6, 7—12 had led the way. For the *hautra(m)* see e.g. BŚS. 3, 27—31; ĀpŚS. 24, 11—19; HŚS. 21, 1—2; for the *yājamāna(m)* see e.g. BŚS. 3, 15—22; BhŚS. 4; ĀpŚS. 4; HŚS. 6; MŚS. 1, 4; ŚŚS. 4, 1; 8—13.

[25] For the *brahmatva(m)* see e.g. BŚS. 3, 23—26; BhŚS. 3, 14—18; 15, 1—5; ĀpŚS. 3, 18—20 and 14, 8—10; VādhŚS. ch. 3; ŚŚS. 4, 6—7; 8, 15.

	Baudhāyana	Bhāradvāja	Āpastamba	Satyāṣāḍha-Hiraṇyakeśin	Vaikhānasa	Vādhūla	Mānava	Vārāha	Kātyāyana
darśapūrṇamāsau	1	1—4	1—4	1, 2—2	3—7		1, 1—4	1, 2—3	2—3
agnyādheya	2	5	5, 1—25	3, 1—6	1	1, 1—3	1, 5	1, 4	4, 7—10
punarādheya	3, 1—3		5, 26—29			1, 4	1, 6, 5	1, 5, 1	4, 11
agnihotra	3, 4—7	6, 1—14	6, 1—28	3, 7	2	1, 5	1, 6, 1—3	1, 5, 2—3	4, 12—15
āgrayaṇa	3, 12	6, 15—18	6, 29—31	3, 8, 23	8, 1—2	3, 4	1, 6, 4	1, 5, 5	4, 6
paśubandha	4	7	7	4	10	5	1, 8	1, 6	6
cāturmāsyāni	5	8	8	5	8, 3—9, 12	4	1, 7	1, 7	5
agniṣṭoma (jyotiṣṭoma)	6—8	10; 12—15	10—13	7—10	12—16	6—7	2		7—11
pravargya	9	11	15	24		part of 13	4		26
ukthya			14		17, 1				
agnicayana	10		16—17	11—12	18—19, 1—15	8	6	2	16—18
vājapeya	11		18, 1—7	13, 1—2	17, 7—18	9	7, 1	3, 1	14
rājasūya	12		18, 8—22	13, 3—7	11, 1—6	10	9, 1	3, 3, 1—4	15
sautrāmaṇī			19, 1—10	13, 8; 23, 1				3, 2, 7—8	19
iṣṭikalpa	13		19, 18—27	22, 3—14			5		
aśvamedha	15		20, 1—23	14, 1		11	9, 2	3, 4	20
dvādaśāha	16, 1—12		21, 1—14			12	7, 2, 1—4, 12	3, 2, 1—2	12
gavām ayana	16, 13—23		21, 15—25	16			7, 2, 4, 13—8, 26	3, 2, 3	13
atirātra	17, 1—10		14, 3, 8—4, 11		17, 3—5				
ekāhāḥ	18		22, 1—13	17, 1—5		15	9, 3		22
ahīnāḥ			22, 14—24	17, 6—8		14	9, 4		23—24
sattrāṇi			23	18			9, 5, 1—4		
prāyaścittāni	27—29	9	9	15	20—21		3		25

necessarily an *atharvavedin*—could perform various other sacrificial functions has no doubt contributed much to this development which, while leading to the abolition of functional differences in later texts, was reversed in the *prayogas* and *paddhatis*.[26]

Some sacrificial rites are represented only in part of the *śrautasūtras*. Whereas the *brāhmaṇa* literature does not speak of the actual slaying of a man for ritual purposes, the human sacrifice *(puruṣamedha)*[27] in ŚB. 13, 6 being a mythical and symbolical rite, and TB. 3, 4 (cf. VS. 30, 5–22) confining itself to enumerating the victims, some *śrautasūtras*, viz. the comparatively recent ĀpŚS. (20, 24, 1–25, 2) and HŚS. (14, 6, 1–14), works that have much in common,[28] describe it as a ritual reality the arrangements of which are closely related to those of the preceding horse sacrifice. The same remark applies to the *sarvamedha*, "the universal sacrifice" held to be the perfection of the human sacrifice and to be performed by "a prince who wishes to become this All" (ĀpŚS. 20, 25, 3ff.; HŚS. 14, 6, 15ff.).[29] A practically identical section on the type of rite called *sava* "an occasion on which power is stimulated or influence is exerted", a one-day *soma* sacrifice characterized by the insertion of an unction,[30] occurs in the same two ritual works:[31] ĀpŚS. 19, 11–15; HŚS. 23, 4; compare TB. 2, 7, 2ff. In the former *sūtra* the logical order is interrupted, because the *savas*, lasting one day, are inserted between the longer rites *(ahīnas)* and the *sattras*. In Hiraṇyakeśin's text this section precedes the *pravargya* and follows the so-called Kāṭhaka-cayana (23, 2 and 3, identical with ĀpŚS. 19, 11–15; cf. TB. 3, 12, 4 and 3), the piling of the great fireplace according to the Kāṭhakas—the tradition regarding this origin is confirmed by the occurrence in KapS. 36, 2f. of a section that is practically identical with TB. 3, 12, 4, 5–7; 3, 1–4; 2, 1–3.[32]

---

[26] Inversely, the ṛgvedic *sūtras* contain sections on the *agnihotra* (ĀśvŚS. 2, 2–5; ŚŚS. 2, 6–10), although this rite does not require a *hotar* function. See also RENOU, in JA 250, p. 165.

[27] See e.g. HILLEBRANDT, R. L., p. 153; KEITH, R. Ph. V. U., p. 347; GONDA, R. I. I, p. 173; EGGELING, ŚB. V, p. XXXIII.

[28] The rite occurs also at KŚS. 21, 1; ŚŚS. 16, 10–14. VaitS. 37, 10ff.

[29] And KŚS. 21, 2; ŚŚS. 16, 15f.; VaitS. 38, 10ff. See K. MYLIUS, in Wissensch. Zeitschrift Univ. Leipzig 17 (1968), p. 275.

[30] See J. GONDA, The Savayajñas, p. 13ff.

[31] Baudhāyana deals with the *savas* in ch. 18 under the heading "sacrifices lasting one day" *(ekāha)*.

[32] Cf. CALAND, Ś. A. II, p. 183; RAGHU VIRA, Kapiṣṭhala-Kaṭha-Saṃhitā, Lahore 1932, p. 20; the passages have been translated by P. E. DUMONT, in PAPhS 95 (1951), p. 660.

2. *The relations between the brāhmaṇas and the śrautasūtras and the mutual relations of the latter*

Those scholars of the West who were more than superficially acquainted with the *sūtra* literature have always been aware of the fact that the *śrauta* texts are not only affiliated with the *brāhmaṇas* but also for the main part based on the latter.[1] However, Löbbecke,[2] after examining the sections on the animal sacrifice in the *brāhmaṇas* and *śrautasūtras* of the Ṛgveda, arrived at the conviction, that the descriptions of the sacrificial ceremonies as found in the *brāhmaṇas* are unsystematic and completely inadequate; that the relations between the *śrautasūtras* and their *brāhmaṇas* are far from close, the cases in which they are in concordance being insignificant; and that the former are directly based on oral tradition and must therefore be regarded as first-rate sources, while the latter are of secondary importance. The few remarks made by Keith[3] on the same subject seemed to confirm these views:[4] "the *sūtras* go far beyond the present *brāhmaṇa* texts . . .; allowance must be made for a considerable development of practice (between both groups of writings)". It took a long time[5] before Tsuji,[6] reconsidering the problem and studying the same portions of the texts as Löbbecke as well as the animal sacrifice according to the Maitrāyaṇīyas,[7] could demonstrate the untenability of the latter's conclusions and the essential correctness of Caland's[8] statement: Those portions of

[1] See e.g. R. Roth, Jāska's Nirukta, Göttingen 1852, p. XXIV; Haug, Ai. B., p. 7; Weber, I. L., p. 16 (cf. however Weber, I. S. VIII, p. 76; IX, p. 353); Caland, Ś. Ā. I, p. 1: "Die Sūtras sind ihrem eigentlichen Wesen nach nur Exzerpte aus diesen Brāhmaṇas"; Ś. Ś., p. XII. This is not to say that the opinions of Roth and Weber on particulars, chronological relations etc. were always correct. For instance, the view that "the *kalpa* came into existence when the *brāhmaṇas* had become incomprehensible" (Roth, op. cit., p. XXVI; XXX) is, as already observed, untenable. On the other hand, already in the middle of the last century Roth and Weber did not fail to compare corresponding chapters of ĀśvŚS. and AiB. (Roth, op. cit., p. XXVI; Weber, op. cit., p. 57; 59; 82). Hillebrandt, Ś. Ś. S. I, p. IX, quoting Weber, observed that "some parts of Ś. Ś. S. are strikingly similar . . . to the *brāhmaṇas*".—The *śrautasūtras* are not directly based on the *saṃhitās*; see also Sāyaṇa, comm. on Ṛgveda, ed. M. Müller, ²London 1890, I, p. 18 (in the Black Yajurveda much *brāhmaṇa* material is incorporated in the *saṃhitās*).

[2] R. Löbbecke, Über das Verhältnis von Brāhmaṇas und Śrautasūtren, Thesis Leipzig 1908; see especially p. 47; 59.

[3] Keith, R. B., p. 50.

[4] Which were endorsed by Winternitz, G. I. L. III, p. 619; H. I. L., I, p. 271.

[5] In the meantime scholars contented themselves with brief statements; see e.g. Renou(-Filliozat), I. C. I, p. 302.

[6] Naoshirô Tsuji (alias Fukushima), On the relation between brāhmaṇas and śrautasūtras, The Tôyô Bunko Ronsô, A XXXIII, Tokyo 1952 (in Japanese, with a long English summary p. 183—247). See also the reviews by L. Renou, in JA 241, p. 280; C. G. Kashikar, in ABORI 35 (1954), p. 285 and in IA 3, 1 (1964), p. 81; Renou, in JA 251 (1963), p. 176; 180 and JA 250, p. 161.

[7] MS. 3, 9, 2—10, 7 and the *mantras* in 1, 2, 14—18; MŚS. 1, 8; VārŚS. 1, 6.

[8] Caland, Ś. Ā. I, p. 1.

the *brāhmaṇas* which describe the rituals proper constitute the nuclei of the *sūtras* in which however the ritual has been systematized. We now know that *brāhmaṇas* and *śrautasūtras* discuss the same liturgy but from entirely different angles and pursuing different purposes and lines of reasoning. As already observed,[9] the authors of the *brāhmaṇas* endeavoured to explain the origin, meaning and raison d'être of the ritual acts etc. and to prove their validity; the compilers of the *sūtras (sūtrakāra)*, on the contrary, aimed at a systematic description of every ritual in its natural sequence. Tsuji saw that we should not try to seek all injunctions given by a *sūtrakāra* in his own *brāhmaṇa* but investigate thoroughly to what extent a given *śrautasūtra* reflects the *vidhi*—the rules or modes of conducting rites—of its *brāhmaṇa*. If an injunction of a *sūtra* is not found in the *brāhmaṇa* of the same recension, it does not necessarily follow that it was unknown to the author of that work, because it was not his task to record all injunctions. But generally most *vidhi* elements contained in a *brāhmaṇa* are adopted or exactly reflected in a *śrautasūtra* of the same school.[10] References to the *brāhmaṇa* are far from rare.[11] As to the ṛgvedic tradition, "whenever the AiB. slightly differs from the KB., the ĀśvŚS. always goes with the former and the ŚŚS. with the latter".[12] In the Sāmaveda, Lātyāyana associates himself with the Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa, but in places also with the Ṣaḍviṃśa; the parallelism is, however, much less close than that between the yajurvedic *sūtras* and *brāhmaṇas*.[13] It is true that there occur discrepancies between *brāhmaṇas* on one hand and *śrautasūtras*[14] on the other but these are partly due to the different aims of a *sūtrakāra* and an author of a *brāhmaṇa*, partly the result of the history of the various *sūtra* recensions, that is of the phases through which they passed and the changes and influences which they underwent. They had sometimes to introduce new elements—among them optional or alternative forms of procedure[15]—under the pressure of changed

[9] See also GONDA, V. L., p. 339; for *vidhi* etc. p. 340; cf. also RENOU, in JA 231, p. 157.

[10] With the exception of the atharvavedic *sūtras*. Only in a very limited number of cases (e.g. ŚŚS. 9, 20, 29; KB. 18, 3) a *sūtrakāra* has reduced the length of a *vidhi* element.

[11] E.g. by means of formulaic expressions *(atha ha bhavati; iti vijñāyate);* or more directly, e.g. BŚS. 14, 22 *yathā . . . brāhmaṇam;* 20, 16: 33, 10 "(a definite act) should not be performed since it is not authorized by the *brāhmaṇa*".

[12] TSUJI, op. cit., p. 187. See also LOKESH CHANDRA's introduction to CALAND, Ś. Ś., p. XII (probably written 1930 or 1931): "As is natural, on the whole the Ś. Ś. S. rests on its Brāhmaṇa, the Kauṣītaki . . . Even the alternatives find a correspondence in the Brāhmaṇa".

[13] RENOU, Écoles, p. 103; for the incomplete JŚS. and JB. see p. 105. See also PARPOLA, Ś. L. D., I, 1, p. 46; 51.

[14] See e.g. LOKESH CHANDRA in CALAND, Ś. Ś., p. XIII.

[15] KŚS. 7, 9, 34; 8, 1, 3 etc. regards as optional ritual acts that had been rejected at ŚB. 3, 3, 4, 31; 3, 4, 1, 5 etc. For the *upavasathagavi* before the *agnyādhāna* (the sacrificer plays at dice with his sons, wins a cow and offers her to the Fathers) see BŚS. 2, 8—11, deviating from TB.; the other *sūtras* prescribe playing at dice after the rite (see KASHIKAR, in ABORI 29, p. 113).

circumstances.[16] Moreover, the *mantras* and the *arthavāda* elements of the *brāhmaṇas*—i.e. the exegesis, the motivation of the rites and of the ritual procedures—must not be left out of consideration, because the *sūtrakāras* drew on these portions as well.[17] In following their *brāhmaṇa* they were at liberty to deviate from the order of its section and chapters[18] and to express themselves in their own style which, generally speaking, is not only succinct but often also allusive.[19] Aiming at completeness they were forced to insert explicit statements where the *brāhmaṇa* had not expressed itself definitely;[20] to supplement *mantras* or *vidhi* elements—"while the ŚB., being full of these is followed step by step by the KŚS. though not without exceptions", the *sūtrakāras* of the Taittirīya recension had "ample room for supplementation".[21] Sometimes also they ignored data found in the *brāhmaṇa* text. Motivations and explanations are often omitted.[22] So the relation between both classes of literature "is not always uniform".[23] Whereas the BŚS. follows its canon faithfully the recent Taittirīya *sūtras*, e.g. Āpastamba, are not free from eclecticism,[24] "although they never disregard entirely the explicit prescriptions given there".[25] This means that the ritual injunctions contained in the *śrautasūtras* do not constitute a redaction of an oral tradition that was independent of the *brāhmaṇas*. In many cases a *sūtra* needs explaining by means of a *brāhmaṇa* text. Thus when ĀpŚS. 1, 9, 12 enjoins that the remainder of the sacrificial substance should be smelt, the reader must know that this procedure is to avoid a dilemma, because both the consumption of the remainders and the non-consumption are dangerous (TB. 1, 3, 10, 6f.).

---

[16] Though rare, cases are not wanting in which an addition made an author contradict his own *brāhmaṇa* (see ĀpŚS. 13, 20, 11 and CALAND's note).

[17] Cf. e.g. ĀpŚS. 6, 19, 4f.; TS. 1, 5, 9, 5f.

[18] See e.g. the references added by Kashikar to his translation of the BhŚS.; CALAND, on ĀpŚS. 6, 11, 5.

[19] There is in the *sūtras* a tendency to phraseological condensation and normalization; for instance, cases of tmesis are eliminated.

[20] ĀpŚS. 13, 9, 2 ("covering with matting") is more precise than TS. 6, 5, 6, 4 ("covering").

[21] TSUJI, op. cit., p. 188. Cf. also HAUG, Ai. B., p. 8. The *agnyādhāna* ritual in the BŚS. is more comprehensive than that in the TB. (cf. KASHIKAR, in ABORI 29, p. 109). For the Āpastambins and other Taittirīyas being influenced by the practices of the followers of other recensions of the Yajurveda and disregarding their own tradition see C. G. KASHIKAR, in Vol. F. B. J. Kuiper, The Hague 1968, p. 398. Compare also such minor additions as ĀpŚS. 7, 23, 3: TS. 6, 3, 10, 1.

[22] Cf. e.g. ĀpŚS. 6, 17, 7: TS. 1, 5, 8, 3; ĀpŚS. 7, 14, 1: TS. 6, 3, 7, 3; ĀpŚS. 7, 18, 12: TS. 6, 3, 9, 2.

[23] Slight discrepancies are not always significant.

[24] Cf. e.g. ĀpŚS. 13, 9, 2 (based on TS. 6, 5, 6, 4 and KS. 28, 6: 160, 13); 13, 14, 11 (TS. 6, 5, 8, 5f.; ŚB. 4, 4, 2, 17); 14, 19, 8 (TS. 3, 1, 7, 3: JB. 1, 344).

[25] In case we possess a *brāhmaṇa* text, but no *śrautasūtra*, a careful arrangement of the *vidhi* elements can to some extent be regarded as an imperfect substitute for a lost *śrautasūtra;* compare Tsuji's study of the *vidhi* elements in the Saṃhitās of the Kaṭhas and Kapiṣṭhalakaṭhas (op. cit., p. 217).

Evidence is on the other hand not wanting which seems to support the assumption that a given *brāhmaṇa* passage presupposes a statement found in a *sūtra* of the same school: for instance KB. 26, 6 presupposes a whole verse which is quoted in full at ŚŚS. 1, 15, 17[26] but not in the Brāhmaṇa.

It is in itself not surprising that the *śrautasūtras* which belong to the same recension differ on points on which there are no clear injunctions in their basic texts;[27] however, difficulties will very likely crop up if we wish to trace the origins of the different views. As will be shown below, *sūtras* are sometimes more or less under the influence of the canon of a different *śākhā*.[28] In particular cases the source must have been one of the lost *brāhmaṇas*.[29] Notwithstanding the intimate relations between *brāhmaṇas* and *śrautasūtras* it is neither possible to reconstruct an original *śrauta* work ('Ursūtra') from which all *sūtras* extant have derived their contents nor to cherish the hope that a critical study of the texts that have been preserved will demonstrate the complete identity of the ritual described with that which is presupposed by the *saṃhitās* and *brāhmaṇas*.

A comparison of the contents of the *sūtras* and the corresponding *brāhmaṇas* shows that the former deal also with sacrificial rites which are not—or at least not adequately—commented upon in the latter. Generally speaking, *śrautasūtras* prescribe more incidental rites[30] and expiations than are found in the *brāhmaṇas*. A survey of the expiations *(prāyaścitta)* contained in Āpastamba's Śrautasūtra[31] shows that many of these rites are it is true based on its own *brāhmaṇa* texts, but also that others are either amplified with other particulars or are foreign to the Saṃhitā and Brāhmaṇa of the Taittirīyas. Since in most cases these particulars occur in other works—among them Kāṭhaka- and Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitās, Pañcaviṃśa- and Aitareya-Brāhmaṇas, Āśvalāyana-Śrautasūtra—the conclusion is warranted that they were introduced from without.

In order to illustrate the procedure prescribed by some ritual authorities in the case of silence or brevity on the part of the basic *brāhmaṇa*[32] attention may for a moment be focussed on the presentation of the first-fruit sacrifices. That the *āgrayaṇa* was known to the redactors of the Taittirīya corpus appears from the occurrences of its name (TS. 5, 7, 2, 4; TB. 1, 4, 1, 5; 1, 5, 4, 2; 1, 6, 1, 9). As is often the case Baudhāyana occupies an intermediate position between the *brāhmaṇa* and the later *sūtras* treating (BŚS. 3, 12) this ritual as a group of solemnities consisting of three parallel sacrifices, one in the rains requiring an

---

[26] CALAND, Ś. Ś., p. 21, and Introduction, p. XIII.

[27] See e.g. KASHIKAR's (S. Ś., p. 20) notes on the injunctions given in the *śrauta* works of the Taittirīya recension on the rite of adding fuel to the sacred fires etc.; TSUJI, op. cit., p. 198; 216; KASHIKAR, S. Bh. I, p. LXX; in ABORI 35, p. 286.

[28] See e.g. TSUJI, op. cit., p. 207.

[29] For these see GONDA, V. L., p. 356. For some quotations in the Baudhāyana corpus see CALAND, Über . . . Baudhāyana, p. 40.

[30] See e.g. ĀpŚS. 4, 16, 18ff.; 5, 25, 10 etc.

[31] ĀpŚS. 9 and 14, 16—34.

[32] The descriptions of rites in the handbooks (HILLEBRANDT, KEITH etc.) give no information on this point.

offering of cultivated millet *(śyāmāka)*, one in the autumn with an offering of rice, and one in spring with an offering of barley. The three sacrifices are described one after the other, the second with literal repetition of the paradigm and the prescripts, the third in an abbreviated form. In all three sacrifices the five stanzas TS. 5, 7, 2 d–h "(Homage) to the one with a hundred weapons, him of a hundred manly energies" are quoted with the first words *(pratīkena)*; the other *mantras* occur also in the Taittirīya corpus, among them TB. 2, 4, 8, 7, prescribed in the first rite "Agni must eat first, for he knows how the oblation (is), . . . he must make the crops auspicious to us".[33] Bharadvāja describes the *āgrayaṇa iṣṭi* as a modification of the full and new moon sacrifice and in a more elaborate form; while making, in a special *sūtra* (6, 18, 5), mention of the offering of barley he does not clearly distinguish between the first and second rite, and between the three seasons references to which are not made.[34] On the other hand, the five stanzas TS. 5, 7, 2 d–h also serve here as the *mantras* consecrating the oblations of clarified butter (6, 16, 18); moreover, the stanza quoted *pratīkena* in TB. 2, 4, 8, 7 "From the good (auspicious) ye have, O gods, led us to the better (good fortune)" as well as the above TB. 2, 4, 8, 7 "Agni . . ." are prescribed in 6, 17, 16 and 17. Prefacing his expositions by the statement that the ritual of the first-fruits of rice, barley and millet follows the paradigm of the new moon sacrifice (6, 29, 3; 5)—the relation with this basic ritual is very close (cf. 6, 30, 12f.)—and making special mention of the ritual performances in the seasons of spring (6, 30, 18) and the rains (6, 31, 1),[35] Āpastamba has some features in common with Baudhāyana, among them the *mantras* TS. 5, 7, 2, d–h (6, 29, 12) as well as the two occurring in TB. 2, 4, 8, 7 "From the good . . ." and "Agni . . ." (6, 30, 8; 10). It is clear that these *mantras* found in two passages of the Taittirīya corpus were regarded as essential elements of the rite—in the very brief treatment of the subject in HŚS. 6, 8, 23 the first is not omitted[36]—but not less evident that the long expositions in Āpastamba and Bhāradvāja Śrautasūtras contain much that was not to be found in the Taittirīya Saṃhitā and Brāhmaṇa and had therefore to be borrowed from other *brāhmaṇa* recensions, especially from the Kāṭhakas.[37] A close examination of all relevant texts brings to light many foreign elements, not infrequently incorporated side by side with material taken from the one tradition.[38] Sometimes it is uncertain which of two foreign sources has contributed some particular or other.[39]

---

[33] See e.g. also TS. 4, 2, 11, 1 etc. = TB. 3, 5, 7, 3.

[34] The officiants knew of course when millet, rice and barley were ripe.

[35] A *śruti* quotation in 6, 31, 14 mentions all three seasons.

[36] See also VaikhŚS. 8, 2: 80, 1; MŚS. 1, 6, 4, 21; the stanzas "From the good" and "Agni" occur in VaikhŚS. p. 80, 2f. and at MŚS. 1, 6, 4, 25 and 26.

[37] See the notes by CALAND, Ś. Ā. I, p. 214ff. We shall have to revert to the influence of the Kāṭhakas on the Taittirīyas.

[38] See especially CALAND's commentary on ĀpŚS. in Ś. Ā. For instance, ĀpŚS. 6, 7, 3 seems to have been enlarged under the influence of KS. 6, 7: 56, 14; for 7, 10, 4 cf. ŚB. 3, 7, 1, 13; 17, 11, 3 is based on TS. 5, 4, 3, 2f. and KS. 21, 6: 44, 13f.

[39] Thus ĀpŚS. 17, 14, 1, and 17, 19, 6 may be based either on MS. or on ŚB.

At this point the mutual relations of the *śrautasūtras* call for closer attention. It must be emphasized that the problems to be faced are different from those that result from an examination of the relations between *śrautasūtras* and *brāhmaṇas*. Whereas the former are, generally speaking, based on *brāhmaṇas* the uncertain absolute and relative chronology of the ritual texts and the obscurity of their mutual connexions complicate matters to a high degree; conclusive proof that there has, in a definite case, been onesided borrowing is often difficult to furnish. From the fact that the author of the Āpastamba-Śrautasūtra has drawn on the Maitrāyaṇī-Saṃhitā it cannot be concluded that he borrowed also from the Mānava-Śrautasūtra.[40] However striking the similarity of the two ritual compendia in many points,[41] it does not prove Āpastamba's dependence on his colleague. When a definite section of a *śrautasūtra* may help to elucidate the correspondent passages in another ritual work it does not follow that these writings are closely related; the probabilities may be more in favour of independent borrowing from a common source. If a particular injunction is found in three *sūtras* this fact cannot generally be used to demonstrate a closer connexion between two of them. If however two *sūtras*—those of Āpastamba and Hiraṇyakeśin—have many identical passages in common there is something to be said for the supposition that occasional identity of more moderate length may be regarded as a single witness. If a text—as in Baudhāyana's case—represents the different views of several authorities matters are apt to become still more complicated. Finally, one should guard against dogmatism and the a priori assumption that a more succinct formulation or a more systematic order always attests to a comparatively recent origin of a passage. It should on the other hand be borne in mind that in judging the relation between identical or similar *vidhi* elements in two *sūtras*, the use or origin of the consecratory formula can suggest a solution of a problem.[42]

[40] See also J. M. VAN GELDER, Mānava Śrauta-sūtra cayana, Thesis Utrecht 1919, p. XIII combating the views of R. GARBE, The Śrauta Sūtra of Āpastamba, III, Calcutta 1902, p. XXIII. For borrowings by MŚS. from the Kaṭhas see CALAND, in GGA 1904, p. 248. Cf. e.g. ĀpŚS. 6, 28, 3: MS. 1, 5, 13: 82, 8.

[41] See also CALAND, On the relative chronology of some ritualistic sūtras, in AO 9, p. 69.

[42] See e.g. TSUJI, op. cit., p. 196 for MŚS. 1, 8, 2, 5; VārŚS. 1, 6, 3, 1; BŚS. 20, 26: 59, 10f.

3. The mantras

According to the Vedic Indians themselves "the sacred tradition (comprises) *mantras* and *brāhmaṇas*",[1] and there is no doubt much truth in the assumption that these two elements of the older Vedic literature are in the main based on the same general conceptions and the same tradition. *Mantras*[2] in a broader sense, including not only the verses of the Ṛgveda and other Saṃhitās but also the formulas of the Yajurveda,[3] are regarded as eternal truth, seen and formulated by the *ṛṣis* of yore, as sacred and inherently powerful. Whereas part of the Ṛgvedic *mantras* were not employed in the various sacrificial ceremonies and others came into ritual use only secondarily, the verses and formulas of the Yajurveda are invariably found fulfilling some ritual function. The *yajus* (sacrificial formulas) are presumably less modified by the versified ṛgvedic *mantras* than the, probably contemporaneous, corresponding yajurvedic verses.

In principle and as a general rule a *sūtra* text adopts the *mantras* of its own school; that is, it quotes its own basic texts. For instance, the fact that most of the *mantras* employed in the Bhāradvāja-Śrautasūtra are identical with, or at least taken from, the Saṃhitā, Brāhmaṇa and Āraṇyaka of the Taittirīyas shows that it belongs to the Taittirīya recension of the Yajurveda. It may be assumed as a fact that the arrangement of the Taittirīya corpus (Saṃhitā, Brāhmaṇa, Āraṇyaka) had already been fixed at the time of the post-Baudhāyana *śrautasūtras*. This assumption is corroborated by the many references in these works to clearly defined complete sections or subdivisions ("lessons", *anuvāka*) or "remaining parts of sections" *(anuvākaśeṣa)*. For instance, BhŚS. 10, 5, 4 it reads:

> "While being purified (the sacrificer) mutters the *anuvāka* (beginning with) '(Soma) who is being purified, who has been born in heaven . . .'"

which is TB. 1, 4, 8 (about thirty lines in print), and in a description of the *pravargya* ritual at 11, 8, 15:

> "When he notices the *hotar* reciting the *mantra* '(With the might and energy) with which, you (, O Aśvins), released the quail that was devoured . . .' (ṚV. 1, 112, 8) the *adhvaryu* recites over the *mahāvīra* (vessel) the *anuvāka* (beginning with) '(As) ten (flames) in the east, (as) ten thou shinest in the south . . .'" (TĀ. 4, 6).

---

[1] KauśS. 1, 3; *āmnāya* "sacred tradition handed down orally".

[2] Cf. J. Gonda, The Indian mantra, Oriens 16 (1963), p. 244 (= Selected Studies, IV, p. 248), and especially V. L., p. 30.

[3] Cf. also V. M. Apte, Mantra rubrics in ritual literature: new lines of investigation, in Volume C. Kunhan Raja, Adyar, Madras 1946, p. 233.—According to KŚS. 1, 3, 1f. *mantras* are of four categories, viz. *ṛc*, *yajus*, *sāman*, and *nigada;* a *yajus* is not subject to metrical restrictions, but a complete sentence; a *nigada* is a *praiṣa*, a *yajus* addressed loudly to another officiant, calling upon him to perform a certain

In ĀpŚS. 17, 11, 4 it reads:

"He offers, dividing the ten sections (beginning with) 'Homage to thy wrath, O Rudra' into three equal portions[4] or pronouncing (it) from the beginning to the words 'Homage to the carpenters' (TS. 4, 5, 1a—4m) and offering the first oblation . . .; next the second oblation beginning with 'and to the makers of chariots' (4, 5, 4m) and ending with 'homage to him who is well-armed' . . . (4, 5, 7f); then the third oblation with the remainder of the section . . ."[5]

As to individual *mantras*, parts of *mantras* or groups of *mantras* that are quoted throughout the *śrautasūtras* to accompany the ritual acts their significance, and especially their applicability to the rites in which they are employed has often been too much underestimated and even been questioned. Scholars of repute contended that in many cases the *mantras* show little connexion with the ritual acts which they are to accompany, or even that the contents of a considerable number of these verses have nothing to do with the acts,[6] although they admitted that in other cases the *mantras* do supply a clue to the correct explanation of the context in which they occur. It is only in the last four decades of this century that this neglected branch of research—the relations between the *mantras* and their contexts in the ritual *sūtras*—has begun to attract the attention which it deserves. True experts had known better[7] and the impression that as a rule the bonds between word and action are rather loose, that in many cases there is no perceptible connexion at all has proved false. On the contrary, a correspondence between formula and rite, so much appreciated by the ancient authorities,[8] is often clearly discernible, albeit sometimes owing to secondary adaptation.[9]

It is true that after their introduction into the yajurvedic *saṃhitās* and *brāhmaṇas*—the initial phase of their liturgical employment in the *sūtra* texts—the ṛgvedic *mantras* appear to have undergone, in these new surroundings, the influence of a long liturgical tradition, true also that they have, in many cases, a somewhat different outward appearance,[10] this is not to say that the ritualists

---

[4] Cf. the *brāhmaṇa* TS. 5, 4, 3, 3. For the division see also BŚS. 10, 48: 48, 12ff. These sections contain the Śatarudrīya litany, for which see J. Gonda, in Vol. D. H. H. Ingalls, forthcoming.

[5] See also BhŚS. 11, 11, 15 (quoting the long TĀ. 4, 42, also prescribed at ĀpŚS. 15, 12, 3 etc.); 11, 17, 4 (TĀ. 4, 15; 16); 13, 16, 1 (TS. 1, 4, 29—31); ĀpŚS. 10, 3, 6 (TĀ. 3, 8); 20, 10, 7 (TS. 7, 2, 11—20); MŚS. 6, 1, 1, 23 *(anuvākaśeṣeṇa);* cf. BŚS. 15, 23: 227, 4; 7.

[6] See e.g. Winternitz, G. I. L. I, p. 236; H. I. L. I, ²p. 241; M. A. Mehendale, in H. C. I. P. I, p. 476.

[7] See e.g. W. Caland, in GGA, 1897, p. 280: "Eine Darstellung des vedischen Rituals ohne die Mantras (ist) keine Darstellung, weil ja oft die Handlung selbst oder deren Zweck erst durch die Mantras erkennbar wird".

[8] See n. 12.

[9] For particulars: Renou, Écoles, p. 7.

[10] See e.g. Hillebrandt, Ritualliteratur, p. 19 and for the variations M. Bloomfield and F. Edgerton, Vedic variants, I, Philadelphia 1930, p. 11.

in adopting this material had proceeded carelessly and arbitrarily.[11] On the contrary, it must have been their endeavour to work upon a principle,[12] because it is clear that they developed some criteria—e.g. invocational, sacramental, oblational, 'mythological'—underlying the citation for ritual employment.[13] In any case, it is impossible to understand the solemn rites without a thorough knowledge of the function, and often also of the history, of the *mantras*, which are intended to consecrate and explain the ritual acts. This is on the other hand not to say that the *brāhmaṇas* in mentioning a verse, chant or formula always inform their readers explicitly or unambiguously of their ritual use, that is of the act which is to be accompanied by them. Nor can it be denied that the application *(viniyoga)* of ṛgvedic verses is often not in harmony with their contents. The fact was already well known to the author of the Bṛhaddevatā,[14] 5, 94f.:

> "(In the case) of the application *(prayoga)* of a *mantra* and the *mantra* (itself), the application is the more important. . . . The *mantras* should be (regarded as) making (only) statements (no rules *(vidhi)* as to their employment *(viniyoga)*). (There may be) a disagreement of the *mantras* with the (application). But the words in them (i.e. the *mantras*), which have a meaning that is generally understood, may express a secondary meaning".[15]

That many *mantras* were secondarily added to the collections of sacred texts to be pronounced or chanted during the ceremonies may be taken for granted, but the question of how many ṛgvedic *mantras* had a genuinely ritual origin, *śrauta* or *gṛhya*, and how many were at a later moment included or adapted will probably never be answered.

Although the importance of the problem would render it worthwhile to consider it in further detail and in all the texts available the following references to research that has already been carried on may suffice to give an idea of the variety of the pertinent facts and the complicated relations between *mantras* and their contexts in the ritual manuals. Whereas the relations between the texts which accompany the magical rites of the Atharvaveda are generally speaking very close and the *mantras* themselves often bear the stamp of their traditionally atharvanic origin—many of them are no doubt old and do not occur in other collections[16]—the *mantras* of the "rites for special wishes"

---

[11] In contrast to other ṛgvedic stanzas found in the yajurvedic *saṃhitās* the so-called *yājyānuvākyās* (see GONDA, V. L., p. 326) to be recited by the *hotar* are taken practically without change from the Ṛgveda (KEITH, V. B. Y. S., p. LXVIII).

[12] Cf. e.g. AiB. 1, 4, 9; 2, 2, 33 "That in the sacrifice is perfect which is perfect in form, that rite which as it is being performed the verse describes". See also V. M. APTE, in BDCRI 1 (1939—1940), p. 14; 127 and 152 (conclusion).

[13] See V. M. APTE, op. cit., p. 233; GONDA, V. L., p. 369.

[14] For the Bṛhaddevatā see GONDA, V. L., p. 33 etc.

[15] Compare also BD. 7, 16 "In formulas (in which it is) not expressly mentioned one should state the deity from the ceremony" and see GONDA, V. L., p. 86.

[16] W. CALAND, Over de 'wenschoffers', Amsterdam Acad. 1898, p. 29; F. EDGERTON, in Volume F. W. Thomas, Bombay (NIA) 1939, p. 78.

(kāmyakarmāṇi)—rites in their complete form known only from the Black Yajurveda[17]—are for the greater part also found in other Vedas[18] and are only superficially related to the ritual contexts. As a rule the only element which *mantra* and action have in common is the deity to whom the sacrifice is offered and whose name appears in the consecratory formula. Yet, although these *mantras* do not seem to have been made with a view to this use, some of them are doubtless appropriate to the occasion; for instance, when in a rite for continuance of life ĀśvŚS. 2, 10, 1f.[19] TS. 1, 3, 14, 4 "Giving life, O Agni, rejoicing in the oblation" is recited.

When the purport of a *mantra* as used in a particular context is not clear it may be elucidated by the relevant *brāhmaṇa* passage,[20] e.g. ĀpŚS. 4, 16, 12:

> "He (the sacrificer) mutters as the 'taking again' *(punarālambha)* of the sacrifice: 'The sacrifice has come into existence, it exists; it has been born, it has waxed great. It has become the overlord of the gods. It must make us overlords. May we be lords of wealth'". In the *brāhmaṇa* TS. 1, 7, 6, 7 the explanation is furnished: "The sacrifice goes away and does not come back; to him who sacrifices knowing the *punarālambha* it does come back. The words cited are the *punarālambha* of the sacrifice, and thereby he takes it again".[21]

In studying the *mantras* as quoted in the *sūtras* account must be taken of the possibility of transference from one ritual context to another.[22] At times a text alludes to such an occurrence—e.g. ŚŚS. 4, 21, 6 and 7 referring to 4, 7, 4 and 5—then again we are entirely thrown on our own resources.[23]

In principle, *mantras* taken from the *saṃhitā* of the *śākhā* to which a *sūtra* work belongs—and which were therefore assumed to be known to those who followed that 'branch' of the Veda—are cited by the initial word or words only *(pratīkena)*, but *mantras* borrowed from other *saṃhitās* or *brāhmaṇas*[24] and those that formed part of the floating mass of formulas were quoted in full. However, this rule—though more or less fixed in the youngest *sūtras*[25]—is not without exceptions and these exceptions are not always comprehensible. Thus Baudhāyana mentions most of the stanzas and *yajus* formulas taken from the

---

[17] In KS., MS., MŚS., TS., BŚS., ĀpŚS., HŚS.; see W. Caland, Altindische Zauberei ('Wunschopfer'), Amsterdam Acad. 1908, p. IV.

[18] E.g. of the 135 stanzas prescribed for these rites in the Taittirīya-Saṃhitā no less than 55 occur also in the Ṛgveda-Saṃhitā and 20 in the Atharvaveda-Saṃhitā. For other particulars see Caland, loc. cit. (n. 16 and 17 above).

[19] ĀśvŚS. 2, 10—13 are devoted to *kāmya iṣṭis*. Cf. also ĀśvŚS. 2, 10, 5f.: TB. 2, 4, 1, 6 (ṚV. 7, 15, 13); for special formulas not found elsewhere e.g. 2, 11, 8.

[20] For some particulars see Kashikar, S. Ś., p. 12.

[21] Compare for instance also ĀpŚS. 6, 28, 11: TS. 3, 4, 10, 5.

[22] See also Apte, in NIA 3, p. 150; Vol. Kunhan Raja, p. 237; Caland, in GGA 1898, p. 62.

[23] The *mantras* TS. 4, 1, 2 t—v which belong to the *agnicayana* are at ĀpŚS. 7, 15, 2 and elsewhere used on the occasion of the carrying of fire round the victim.

[24] Cf. e.g. Ānartīya on ŚŚS. 5, 9, 10 *śākhāntarīyatvāt sakalapāṭhaḥ*.

[25] W. Caland, Bijdrage tot de kennis der Atharvaveda-literatuur, Amsterdam Acad. 1904, p. 2.

Taittirīya-Saṃhitā in extenso.[26] Āpastamba and other later Taittirīyas quote their Saṃhitā *pratīkena*, and their Brāhmaṇa at full length *(sakalapāṭhena)*; why ?[27] The case may even present itself that part of the manuscripts of a text prefer *pratīkena*, others complete quotations.[28] Irrespective of these irregularities the use of abbreviated quotations is one of the characteristics of the *sūtra* style, although—as in other languages—it became the vogue in references to well-known hymns and other texts. Prolix writers were averse to this practice. ĀśvŚS. 1, 1, 17—19 gives some rules regarding the use and extent of *pratīkas*:

> "When the (entire first) quarter *(pāda)* (of a ṛc stanza) is quoted, (the quotation of) the (entire) stanza (is indicated). If less than the (first) *pāda* at the beginning of a *sūkta* is quoted, (then) the (entire) hymn (is indicated). If more than a (complete first) *pāda* of a stanza (is quoted) from any (part of the hymn) a group of three consecutive stanzas (beginning with that stanza is indicated)".

These rules also are far from being generally obeyed.[29] Occasionally a *pratīkena* quotation is accompanied by a characterization: ĀśvŚS. 2, 1, 27 quoting ṚV. 1, 1, 3 and 1, 91, 12 adds the qualification *puṣṭimantrau* "the *mantras* that bring about prosperity". Such an addition may stem from the *brāhmaṇa*; for instance "the two stanzas addressed to Agni, the purifier" (TS. 1, 6, 6 lm) in ĀpŚS. 4, 16, 2 is taken from TS. 1, 7, 6, 4.

Next we have to consider the frequent *sūtra* places where a *mantra* is quoted that is either foreign to the *saṃhitā* followed by the author[30] of the manual or found there only in another form,[31] the differences varying from slight phonetic variations to radical changes.[32] For instance, only part of ĀpŚS. 1, 20, 11 is identical with TS. 1, 1, 10 k:

> "With an eye that is above deceit I gaze on thee for increment of wealth, brilliant energy, fair offspring; in order to protect (my) eye I pronounce (this) blessing" as against "With an eye that is above deceit I gaze on thee for fair offspring".

---

[26] One should not, with SINGH, C. S. KŚS., p. 25 consider this feature a mark of inferiority.

[27] See also CALAND, Ś. Ā. I, p. 3; RENOU, Écoles, p. 26; cf. P. VON BRADKE, in ZDMG 36, p. 425.

[28] H. J. W. SALOMONS, Het Hindoesche huisritueel volgens de school van Bhāradvāja, Thesis Utrecht 1913, p. XII.

[29] In the ĀśvGS. only the first rule is observed (see A. F. STENZLER, Indische Hausregeln, I, 2, Leipzig 1865, p. 4; 49; V. M. APTE, in BDCRI 1, p. 18). For different rules: LŚS. 6, 3, 1—3. Compare also RENOU, Écoles, p. 26; CALAND, Bijdrage . . . Atharvaveda-literatuur, p. 3.

[30] See e.g. ĀśvŚS. 8, 13, 31 *chandomā daśamaṃ cāha uttamaṃ tu mahāvrataṃ / ahīnaikāhaḥ sattrāṇāṃ prakṛtiḥ samudāhriyate*; ĀpŚS. 1, 10, 6; 2, 4, 2 the four stanzas in reprehension of Prajāpati ĀpŚS. 21, 12, 3; the four stanzas in MŚS. 1, 6, 2, 17. Not infrequently these *mantras* occur in two or three *sūtra* works.

[31] For instance, the *mantra* in ĀpŚS. 4, 12, 6 differs from its source, MS. 1, 4, 1: 47, 12 only in the readings *gaccha* instead of *gamyāt* and *yajño mā āgacchatu* instead of *yajño devān gamyāt*.

[32] Cf. also RENOU, Écoles, p. 29. In this section I confine my observations on this point to the *śrautasūtras*.

Cases are not lacking in which a formula that several texts have in common is different everywhere.[33] The phenomenon has often been noticed[34] and was already in Indian antiquity explained by the hypothesis that *sūtrakāras* must have been acquainted with sources—'branches' of the Veda[35]—which are long since irrecoverably lost. In part of the occurrences this hypothesis may hit the mark,[36] but as a general explanation it is unacceptable, because nobody can vouch for it that the *mantras* were absolutely fixed and invariable so that any deviation was necessarily regarded as authentic property of a definite Vedic school. The hypothesis would also imply that all quotations in the *sūtras* are completely accurate and reliable. One glance at Bloomfield's Vedic Concordance and the Vedic Variants[37] suffices to show that neither supposition can be absolutely true. It is not even easy to detect unmistakable tendencies. But, while there can be no doubt that the *sūtrakāras* held the tradition of their own school in respect and had a high opinion of the competence of their predecessors,[38] they accepted—and often had to accept—a number of deviations and variations which were either already characteristic of their secondary sources or the product of their own editorial activity. Numerous *mantras* create the impression of being adapted, re-arranged, modified, added, improvised, or combined with other formulas.[39] In many cases it is certain or at least probable that the origin of such variants must be sought in another school or even in a foreign *saṃhitā*. For instance, the *mantras* prescribed to a householder who goes on a journey or comes home in ĀśvŚS. 2, 5 are taken from the Yajurveda. The Black Yajurveda has in this respect exerted an unmistakable influence upon the sāmavedic Jaiminīya-Śrautasūtra—and Baudhāyana on the sāmavedic treatises in general.[40] The Kauthumas, likewise sāmavedins, had rather close relations with the White Yajurveda[41] who had also influence upon the *śrāddha* rites of other schools.[42] A close agreement between a few *mantras* of

[33] See e.g. CALAND, Ś. Ā. III, p. 273; ŚŚS., p. 254.

[34] See e.g. MAX MÜLLER, A history of ancient Sanskrit literature, London 1859, p. 475; A. LUDWIG, in Abh. böhm. Ges. 1889, 5, p. 4.

[35] It may be recalled that the term *śākhāntara* "another branch of the Veda" is found since ĀpDhS. 1, 10, 20; 1, 12, 4; HDhS. 1, 3, 47; 1, 4, 4.

[36] For instance, when ĀpŚS. 6, 19, 6; 6, 27, 1; 7, 11, 10 quotes passages from the Vājasaneyaka which are not found in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa etc. known to us.

[37] See above, n. 10.

[38] Cf. also APTE, in BDCRI 1, p. 15. It should be borne in mind that individuals, like texts, were associated with one definite school; for details see RENOU, Écoles, p. 17.

[39] See also RENOU, Écoles, p. 7; 32; APTE, in Vol. Kunhan Raja, p. 238 and in NIA 3, p. 240; TSUJI, op. cit., p. 199; 200; 203 etc.;—see e.g. ĀpŚS. 6, 6, 10; 6, 8, 11 (cf. BŚS. 3, 6: 75, 5); 6, 14, 5ff.; 6, 24, 2f.; as to ĀpŚS. 6, 5, 6 compare TB. 2, 1, 2, 9f.; ĀśvŚS. 2, 2, 16 seems to be a magic formula.

[40] See RENOU, Écoles, p. 15.

[41] See D. GAASTRA, Bijdrage tot de kennis van het Vedische ritueel. Jaiminīya-śrautasūtra, Thesis Utrecht 1906, p. XXIV (many *mantras* are identical with or similar to those of TS., MS., BŚS., ĀpŚS., MŚS.); PARPOLA, Ś. L. D., I, 1, p. 94.

[42] See CALAND, Ahnenkult, p. 148; in BTLV 6, 1, p. 3; in Arch. Rel. 11, p. 129.

any two works unknown to us from elsewhere can be explained on the assumption that both the works might have drawn upon the same floating tradition. More than once however the determination of the exact source or history of a *mantra* is a difficult problem.

Minor modifications—e.g. a singular instead of a plural, a feminine form instead of a masculine—to be introduced in a *mantra* as circumstances may require are—for instance at ĀśvŚS. 3, 2, 14; 3, 4, 15—indicated by the *sūtrakāra* himself.

From time to time a unique *mantra* or formulary is of special religious or literary value; for instance, the long invocation of Iḍā, the representative of the essence of the offering or 'Opfersegen' in ĀśvŚS. 1, 7, 7 which is remarkable for the continuous reciprocity or parallelism:

> "Iḍā has been called near together with Heaven, with the *bṛhat(sāman)*, with Āditya. Iḍā must call us near together with Heaven, with the *bṛhat(sāman)*, with Āditya. Iḍā has been called near together with the atmosphere, with the *vāmadevya(sāman)*, with Vāyu (Wind). Iḍā must call us near together with the atmosphere, with the *vāmadevya(sāman)*, with Vāyu . . .",[43]

or the morning litany of the Aitareyins, consisting of a hundred ṛgvedic stanzas and quoted at Āśv. 4, 13 and ŚŚS. 6, 2ff.[44]

4. Paribhāṣās, prāyaścittas and pariśiṣṭas

A few words in description of another common feature, viz. the *paribhāṣā-(-sūtra)s*,[1] may find a place here. The term *paribhāṣā* is used for general rules of interpretation included by authors in their works, applicable throughout and prevailing over particular rules or prescripts on different subjects. Stated once for all they lay down restrictions when rules are stated without any specification or limitation and serve as aids to the proper understanding or application of statements or injunctions. It is self-evident that they contribute much to the realization of the ideal of stylistic conciseness. They became indeed a necessity for the systematic treatment of the vast and increasing material embodied in these works. If appearances are not deceptive the tendency has been to make the *paribhāṣā* sections more complete, although "the later the text the more complete the *paribhāṣā*"[2] is perhaps too hasty a judgment. The

[43] See K. Mylius, in ZMR 51, p. 347.

[44] See Caland and Henry, L'agniṣṭoma, p. 130 and for a translation, ibidem, p. 417.

[1] Compare G. V. Devasthali, in IA 3, 3 (1969), p. 1; L. Renou, in JA 233, p. 118ff.; 251, p. 178; Kane, H. Dh. II, p. 982; see also K. V. Abhyankar, On *paribhāṣā* works in Sanskrit grammar, ABORI 36 (1955), p. 157.

[2] Renou, in JA 233, p. 120.

paribhāṣās in the several *śrautasūtras* differ in character and position. In some works (Lāṭyāyana, Vārāha, Vaitāna etc.) the *paribhāṣās* are in the form of coherent sections placed together at the beginning; in others such an initial section is supplemented by *paribhāṣās* in later chapters.[3] Further compilers however preferred to place them elsewhere: Āpastamba, for instance, collected most of them in 24, 1—4 (159 *sūtras*) mentioning some other general directions in different chapters.[4] Āśvalāyana scattered them over the books I and II. The subjects touched upon in the *paribhāṣā-sūtras* admit of a certain classification: there are governing rules in the proper sense of the term, but also rules regarding substitution, combination etc.[5] Whereas those of LŚS. 1, 1, 1—6 consist exclusively of the interpretatory clues to the abbreviations, the general rules being mentioned dispersedly as the occasion arises, Āpastamba, Śāṅkhāyana and others combine different types in the same sections; this may be a later development.[6] Regarding the treatment of the subjects the *paribhāṣā-sūtras* do not follow any definite order. Since the *paribhāṣā* portions of these works often are remarkably similar irrespective of recension or school they may, notwithstanding an unmistakable lack of coherence, have originated in a common nucleus, or rather have been modelled on one and the same prototype. It has even been supposed that the credit for introducing this procedure—collecting general rules to be expounded by teachers before they started on their courses of instruction—must be given to Baudhāyana.[7] If so, the contents of the *paribhāṣā* section of the so-called *karmāntasūtra*, chapter 24, 1—11 of his Śrautasūtra, a directory for the benefit of those who wish to officiate systematically composed in didactic and explicative style, can give us a fairly good idea of an early "discourse round the text", probably the original meaning of the term:[8]

> "One should understand the ritual procedure from a a group of five, viz. from the metrical texts of the Veda (*chandas*, i.e. the *mantra* portions of the Taittirīya-Saṃhitā), the *brāhmaṇa* (i.e. all *brāhmaṇa* texts of the Taittirīyas), 'faith' (conviction, or certainty as a ground or means of action, *pratyaya*), by means of the method (system, rules, *nyāya*) and by means of the 'structure' (of the sacrifice, *saṃsthā*[9]). When we say 'from the metrical texts of the Veda . . .' that means that one should, in accordance with the order (of the *mantras*) observed in the tradition, (conclude) 'this (act must be performed) first, this (later)'. Moreover,

---

[3] E.g. HŚS. 1, 1; 3, 1; 8; 4, 4; 15, 1, 1—7; ŚŚS. 1, 1—2; 16; 17 etc.; for a complete survey see KASHIKAR, S. Ś., p. 155.

[4] ĀpŚS. 2, 12, 5; 4, 1, 2—7; 9, 1, 1—6. For a translation of these Āpastambīya-Paribhāṣās see F. M. MÜLLER, in S. B. E. XXX, p. 311 (with an introduction); for an edition A. MAHADEVA SASTRI, Mysore 1894.

[5] See also KASHIKAR, S. Ś., p. 154.

[6] PARPOLA, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 28.

[7] RENOU, in JA 233, p. 118.

[8] For a more complete German translation of 24, 1 see CALAND, Über . . . Baudhāyana, p. 29.

[9] For this term see L. SILBURN, Instant et cause, Paris 1965, p. 60.

the very *mantra* announces the ritual act; it explains the act (*anuvāda*, i.e. any portion of the *brāhmaṇa* which comments on, illustrates or explains a *vidhi*), (e.g.) if it is said (in the *brāhmaṇa*) '... Go along the wide atmosphere' (Taittirīya-Saṃhitā 1, 1, 2 p). What one cannot execute by means of the metrical texts one should try to execute by means of the *brāhmaṇa*, for the *brāhmaṇa* prescribes with authority the purport of the undefined *mantras*, viz. 'he performs this (act) with this *(mantra)*, that (act) with that *(mantra)*'. For example, if the text mentions the *mantra* 'For refreshment (food) thee, for strength thee' (TS. 1, 1, 1 a) he cuts off a (definite)[10] branch ... Moreover, a *brāhmaṇa* prescribes also the purport of acts that are not accompanied by *mantras*, when for instance it reads 'At a distance of eight steps a brahmin should establish the sacred fire ...' (TB. 1, 1, 4, 1) ... As to the (above) 'by means of the structure', when the *soma* has been stolen one should extract juice from *ādāra* or *phālguna* plants".[11]

Section 2 deals with some fundamental concepts relating to *mantras*, sacrificial rites etc. which are different in practice and applicability (topic, reference, place of operation, *adhikaraṇa*) ... 'If a burnt offering is successfully performed with a definite *(mantra)* whatever it is one should perform it with that *(mantra)*; that is its *adhikaraṇa*'. In section 3 an explanation is offered of the distinction between the 'warp' *(tantra)* and the 'woof' *(āvāpa)* of a sacrificial rite, that is of the framework, standing model, or those components which it has in common with other rites and those that vary from ritual to ritual and are therefore the special characteristic features.[12] In section 4 the author deals with the number of the basic forms *(saṃsthā)* of the *pākayajñas*, *haviryajñas* and *soma* sacrifices[13] and other distinctions, defines and explains terminology etc.: "... All that is offered at another place than in the triad of sacred fires, whatever it may be, is (included in the category of the) *pākayajñasaṃsthāḥ*". The seven *somasaṃsthās* are enumerated: *agniṣṭoma*, *atyagniṣṭoma*, *ukthya*, *ṣoḍaśi*, *vājapeya*, *atirātra* and *aptoryāma*. "The sacrificial ceremonial of the *agniṣṭoma* is (also) that of the *atyagniṣṭoma*. That of the *ukthya* is (also) that of the *ṣoḍaśī* and *vājapeya* ...".[14] Section 5 answers the question of the difference between the two terms used in the Baudhāyana corpus *pūrvā tatiḥ* and *uttarā tatiḥ* "the antecedent and the subsequent series of ceremonies". The standard (ritual) is *pūrvā tatiḥ*, and what one arranges (modifies) is *uttarā tatiḥ*; (for instance,) the establishment of the ritual fires is *pūrvā tatiḥ*, the re-establishment *uttarā tatiḥ*; of the vegetarian sacrifices *(iṣṭi)* the full and new moon sacrifices are the *pūrvā tatiḥ*, all the optional rites *(kāmyā iṣṭayaḥ)* the *uttarā tatiḥ* ..." There follows an enumeration of the seven cultivated and the seven wild plants, of the seven domesticated and the seven wild animals, and of the seven metres increasing by four (syllables),[15] etc. After a brief discussion of other distinctions in section 6 the author turns to the use of *mantras* (7), for instance: "One should not, for the sake of a ritual act, interrupt a *mantra*". In (the case of) the immolation of a victim the *mantra* that is handed down is short, the act long, in other cases however, the act is short but the *mantra* long. Section 8 and 9 deal with the omission of further indications which

[10] See e.g. ĀpŚS. 1, 1, 10.

[11] Cf. ŚB. 4, 5, 10, 1ff.

[12] See e.g. ŚŚS. 1, 16, 3; ŚGS. 1, 9, 12 (with OLDENBERG's note in S. B. E. XXIX, p. 28); GGS. 1, 8, 16.

[13] See p. 468f. above.

[14] The essential difference between these rites lies in the fact that in each succeeding ceremony some element is added.

[15] I.e. from the *gāyatrī* stanza consisting of three octosyllabic units to the *jagatī* stanza composed of four times twelve syllables.

can be dispensed with because the context is clear (to the one who memorizes the contents of this section). "If it reads: 'He sacrifices on a ground for gambling'[16] (or: 'He sacrifices on a crossroads' (TB. 1, 6, 10, 3)) the fire (into which the oblations are to be poured) is not indicated" . . . "(If it reads:) 'He offers by means of an *arka*-leaf (which is used instead of a spoon'),[17] (the bracketed words are omitted)". And so on. Section 10 gives information on the numbers of oblations (cakes) made of ground rice and offered on dishes required in performing the several sacrificial rites; section 11 on the royal sacrifices *rājasūya* etc.

In illustration of the *paribhāṣā* style of some later *śrautasūtras* a few other passages may be subjoined. BhŚS. 6, 15, 5; KŚS. 1, 8, 45; ĀśvŚS. 1, 1, 12; 15f.; 2, 1, 6:

"In this connexion (there is) this perpetual (general) rule: in all *iṣṭis* and animal sacrifices the norms (prescribed) for the *darśapūrṇamāsau* are (to be) followed"; *juhvāvacane* "(if there is) no special direction (to the contrary the oblation should be offered) with the *juhū* (ladle)"; *ekāṅgavacane dakṣiṇaṃ pratīyāt* "if there is question of one limb one should understand the right one";[18] *dadātīti yajamānam* "(whenever the word) 'he gives' (is used one should understand that) the sacrificer (is the agent of the action)"; "(whenever) in an expiatory rite (the words) 'he offers', 'he mutters' (are used) the *brahman*"; "when in the case of many (ritual acts) instructions (are given) on many (details) (these must) be executed in the corresponding order".

A *paribhāṣā-sūtra* may contain a motivation, e.g. KŚS. 1, 3, 5:

"The beginning of an act must be made to coincide with the ends of the (consecratory) *mantras*, because the *mantras* denote (name) the act".[19]

Or it may be a generalization of a preceding special rule: BhŚS. 5, 4, 18:

"In this order (mentioned in 17) (the relevant) rites are henceforward performed (in the fireplaces)".[20]

Although the *gṛhyasūtras*, being annexed to the *śrauta-sūtras*, did not generally speaking need special *paribhāṣās* some of them begin with a series of general rules, e.g. ĀpGS. 1, 1, 1–6:

"Now are mentioned the ceremonies which are derived from customary practice. They are to be performed during the northern course of the sun, on (days of) the fortnight of the waxing moon, on auspicious days. By (a sacrificer) who wears the sacrificial cord over the left shoulder (the ritual acts should be performed) from left to right. The beginning (should be made) on the east side or on the north side. And also the end".[21]

---

[16] Cf. ŚB. 5, 4, 4, 22.

[17] Cf. ŚB. 9, 1, 1, 4; 9; KŚS. 18, 1, 1; BŚS. 23, 7: 159, 11.

[18] For ĀśvŚS. 1, 1, 8–22 etc. see also KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 982.

[19] It is not surprising that in the texts the same general rule should be formulated differently, that is more or less concisely; compare e.g. BhŚS. 1, 2, 1 *uttarasyādinā pūrvasyāvasānam* "the end of the former (*mantra* is known) by the beginning of the next" with KŚS. 1, 3, 9 *parādinā pūrvāntam*; MŚS. 1, 1, 1, 5 *ādinottarasya pūrvasyāntaṃ vidyāt*. Cf. CALAND, on Ś. Ā. III, p. 389; ĀpŚS. 24, 2, 4; RENOU, in JA 233, p. 121.

[20] Also BhŚS. 6, 1, 7; 6, 15, 5.

[21] See also GGS. 1, 1, 1ff.; KhGS. 1, 1, 1ff.

The *paribhāṣā-sūtras* of the Kauśika-sūtra (1, 1–23) begin with an enumeration of the sources of the rites described in the work (1, 1–8); what follows is a set of rules that focus attention on the differences between rites for the gods and rites for the Fathers. Another series of more special *paribhāṣās* (65 *sūtras*) fills the sections 7–9:

> 7, 1 "(When the direction) "he eats" (is given, one should,) if there is no special direction, (understand) "a dish of rice boiled in milk"; 7, 19 "One should leave (an object such as an amulet which) one puts on for three days, from the thirteenth of a fortnight, in thick sour milk and honey".[22]

Cases of stray or supplementary *paribhāṣā-sūtras* are not absent.[23]

Another subject which is often treated separately is the expiatory rites *(prāyaścitta)*.[24] They play a considerable part in the treatises on solemn ceremonial practice as well as the other *sūtras*. In the *śrauta* literature they are partly scattered throughout the texts,[25] partly collected so as to form special chapters.[26] The pertinent passages are not infrequently very detailed and furnish us with full particulars and valuable information on various eventualities such as neglect, omissions, mistakes, abnormal occurrences, in short on any interruption of the normal and orderly progress of the ceremonies. Says the VaikhŚS. 20, 1: 298, 5:

> "In case of an error in the (regular) performance an expiatory rite is prescribed in order to secure the suppression of (the detrimental effects of) the mistakes etc.".

For instance, ĀśvŚS. 3, 10, 2; 10; MŚS. 3, 1, 17; BhŚS. 9, 6, 1:

> "In default of (the sacrificial substance) which has been prescribed (one should utilize) a substitute; . . . if one worships (the gods) in the fires of another (person) or if another (person) worships (the gods) in the fires of (the sacrificer) . . . or if a carriage, a dog or a man goes between the three sacred fires, or if the sacrificer, on his way (to the sacrifice), comes to die (one should perform) an *iṣṭi*"; "If the oblations are stolen or are spoiled, he shall proceed to offer a libation of ghee, then he shall offer again"; "If (the *agnihotra* vessel is leaking) before it has been placed on the fire, one should recite over it a *mantra* addressed to Viṣṇu".

The important but in many places corrupt Prāyaścittakalpa of the (Paippalāda) Atharvaveda is in spite of a considerable difference in contents in most manuscripts considered a continuation of the Vaitāna-Sūtra.[27] This work contains many digressions in an archaic *brāhmaṇa* style in which the rites discussed are founded on a theoretical basis and gives evidence of the existence of differences

---

[22] For a complete German translation see CALAND, A. Z., p. 10.

[23] See e.g. BGPS. 1, 3, 6; ŚGS. 5, 10, 3.

[24] Cf. GONDA, R. I. I, p. 130; 293; CALAND, Ś. Ā. II, p. 65.

[25] See e.g. BhŚS. 1, 20: 30, 18; 4, 10: 125, 15; HŚS. 3, 1, 27; ŚŚS. 2, 7, 6ff.; 5, 17, 12.

[26] See BŚS. 27–29; BhŚS. 9; ĀpŚS. 9; HŚS. 15; VaikhŚS. 20; 21; MŚS. 3; KŚS. 25; ĀśvŚS. 3, 10ff.; ŚŚS. 3, 19; 20 etc.

[27] See CALAND, in WZKM 18, p. 197.

of opinion with regard to the ritual acts recommended. There are points of contact with the Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa and the Kauśika-Sūtra.

Although the *pariśiṣṭas*,[28] like the *prāyaścittas*,[29] are not exclusively proper to the *śrauta* literature a comprehensive characterization of this genre—which plays an important part in the ancient Sanskrit literature in general—may find a place here. Supplementary texts are sometimes independent works,[30] sometimes additions to original manuals which in the eyes of a redactor or compiler were not in all respects complete. The main object of a *pariśiṣṭa* (i.e. paralipomenon) being to complete an existing work, it must be noticed that the incompleteness was not necessarily an imperfection of the original *sūtra* text. It may have struck a later redactor that from his point of view the original work had some lacunas or deficiencies because the ritual had in course of time become enlarged or more complicated. Just as it is obvious that the *sūtrakāras*—e.g. Baudhāyana[31]—were eager to incorporate also rites or variants of rites that had become in vogue after the compilation of their *saṃhitās* and *brāhmaṇas* even if there was no direct scriptural authority, the Mūlyādhyāya-Pariśiṣṭa of the Kātyāyana-Śrautasūtra prescribes substitutes for *dakṣiṇās* which it was no longer possible to offer. In the case of the older *śrauta* works additions may have been made already at an early date because the possibility of omission was by no means imaginary. The occurrence of modifications in the ritual being recognized the incorporation or addition of supplements soon became an unobjectionable practice. One should however distinguish between such supplements of limited scope added at an early date—e.g. the Dvaidha portion of the Baudhāyana-Śrautasūtra—and supplements of varied contents as were often added in later times, e.g. the Baudhāyana-Gṛhya-Śeṣasūtra. The Vārāha-Śrautasūtra has extensive paralipomena dealing with *śrauta* as well as *gṛhya* material. The so-called Āśvalāyana-Gṛhya-Pariśiṣṭa is rather a revised enlargement of the Gṛhyasūtra and written in the *prayoga* style. There are, moreover, works of this class that introduce completely new matter, for instance the Hautra-Pariśiṣṭas of Āpastamba. By their very nature *pariśiṣṭas* usually lack homogeneity; even within the same section there may be unrelated topics.

---

[28] For a detailed survey see KASHIKAR, S. Bh. I, p. LXXXV.

[29] Cf. e.g. BGS. 2, 9, 8; BhGS. 2, 16; 3, 15: 84, 2; PGS. 3, 12.

[30] For instance, the Atharvaveda-Pariśiṣṭas; see GONDA, V. L., p. 307.

[31] Cf. KASHIKAR, S. Bh. I, p. LXVI. For the eighteen *pariśiṣṭas* of the White Yajurveda and the *pariśiṣṭas* ascribed to Kātyāyana—e.g. Nigama-Pariśiṣṭa, a sort of glossar on the White Yajurveda and the Pravarādhyāya—see WEBER, I. L., ²p. 157; RENOU, Écoles, p. 162.

5. *The individual śrautasūtras*

While editing, in the beginning of this century, the long and most important Baudhāyana-Śrautasūtra[1] Caland wrote a fundamental treatise on the whole ritual corpus of this school.[2] At the end he expressed the hope that he had excited the interest of his colleagues in this work. From the fact that no reaction was forthcoming for about half a century it appears once again that as long as they have not been translated many Sanskrit texts are ignored. The Baudhāyana-Śrautasūtra is in all probability the oldest *sūtra* of the Taittirīya recension and has moreover some individual features which distinguish it from the other works of this class.[3]

First, at BGS. 3, 9, 6 the author, while enumerating some names of authorities, makes mention of "Kāṇva Bodhāyana, the maker of a *pravacana*, Āpastamba, the maker of a *sūtra* and Satyāṣāḍha Hiraṇyakeśin".[4] From the different titles added to the names of the ritualists it is clear that this author distinguished between Baudhāyana's work, being a *pravacana*, and Āpastamba's, being a *sūtra*. It has been argued[5] that the title *pravacanakāra* given to Baudhāyana[6] shows "that the followers of his school placed him before and above all other teachers of the ritual". If a teacher is called *pravacanakāra* "that can only mean that he is something more than a common *sūtrakāra* and is considered to be the originator of the whole system of instruction among its followers". Caland preferred to regard a *pravacanakāra* as the one who fixed the ritual in the oral tradition, a *sūtrakāra* as the person who moulded the material into a regular *sūtra*.[7] It seems possible to harmonize both explanations: a *pravacanakāra* is the authority who before others, no doubt orally,[8]

---

[1] The Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra ed. by W. Caland, Calcutta, I, 1904; II, 1907; III, 1913 (1200 pages in print). See also C. G. Kashikar, A critical study of the ritualistic sūtras, in Comm. Vol. P. K. Gode, Poona 1960, p. 203.

[2] Caland, Über . . . Baudhāyana.

[3] For the *śrautasūtras* in general see Hillebrandt, Ritualliteratur, p. 24; Renou, Écoles, p. 173; Kashikar, Śrautakośa, I, English section, I, p. 13; and S. Ś.; Gopal, I. V. K., chapter I.

[4] For these names see also chapter I, section 2. In BhGS. 3, 11 Bhāradvāja is called a *sūtrakāra*.

[5] Bühler, in S. B. E. XIV, p. XXXVI.

[6] Or Bodhāyana, as he is sometimes called.

[7] Caland, Über . . . Baudhāyana, p. 3. Other, unconvincing explanations are "hander-down" (Oldenberg translating, in S. B. E. XXX, p. 245, HGS. 2, 20, 1 where the term occurs in the plural); and *pravacana* "a mixed genre of literature, partly *sūtra*, partly *brāhmaṇa*" (Winternitz, in WZKM 17, p. 289 and "'exposé ouvert', par opposition aux tendances mi-ésotériques des *brāhmaṇa*" (Renou, in JA 251, p. 180).—For *pravacana* see also Kashikar, S. Ś., p. 43; Kane, H. Dh. I, p. 27.

[8] According to Caland, op. cit. p. 4 the use of the demonstrative pronoun *ayam* and some expressions which need elucidation by means of a gesture prove that Baudhāyana's work was intended to be handed down orally. These gestures were in any case made by the teacher who explained the text orally.

"announces, expounds, divulges"[9] the ritual of a definite school. This explanation is in harmony with the character of the work as a link between the *brāhmaṇa* literature and the normal *sūtras*. Especially the last chapters *(praśna*[10]*)* of the Śrautasūtra (in the *uttarā tatiḥ*) are something between a *brāhmaṇa* and a *sūtra* because the motivation of the prescripts is often added. Among the explanations are many myths, part of them unknown from other sources.

One of the mythical tales is the story of Ṛtuparṇa, the son of Bhaṅgāśvina, a more extended version of which occurs in the Mahābhārata:[11] this king who had sacrificed without giving a share to Indra was transformed by the god into a woman, who gave birth to a hundred sons. Indra stirred up strife between these and the hundred sons who had been procreated by Ṛtuparṇa when he was a man. When all of them had been killed Indra left the revival of one group of sons to the mother's choice. She chose the latter. "That is why they say: 'To a woman (mother) sons are dearer (than to a father)'". Notice the difference between the last sentence of the Vedic mythical tale and the Mahābhārata, in which the mother, after making her choice, adds the motivation "A woman's (mother's) love is greater than a man's".

It is in perfect harmony with the character of this work that its author has not aimed at the well-known brevity and conciseness of the *sūtra* style. On the contrary, cases of repetition (also of longer passages), prolixity and diffuseness are far from rare. The several rites are dealt with independently. Verbs are often repeated, implications avoided; the phrases are as a rule long and the syntax is free.

Another remarkable feature is the structure of the work. After dealing with the rites of full and new moon and the establishment of the sacred fires[12] it treats in the ten sections of chapter III of the *punarādheya*, *agnihotra*, the worship of Agni *(agnyupasthāna)*, the oblations to the deceased ancestors on the eve of new moon *(piṇḍapitṛyajña)*, the *āgrayaṇa*, the taking leave of the fires (by one who goes on a journey), the duties of the sacrificer, *brahman* priest and the *hautra*; and in the chapters IV etc. of other sacrificial rites mention of which has already been made. Chapter XIII[13] contains the *kāmyeṣṭis*. Chapter XIV, the *aupānuvākyam*, has its name in common with chapter *(kāṇḍa)* III of the Taittirīya-Saṃhitā which contains additional matter dealing with the *soma* sacrifice and some points of the full and new moon rites and other ceremonies with special reference to *mantras*. Chapter XIV, 1–22 of the Śrautasūtra deals, in the order of the Saṃhitā[14] and with much repetition, with the

[9] This is the meaning of the verb *pra-vac-*; see also LŚS. 1, 2, 7; 9; BGS. 1, 7, 6; KaṭhaUp. 1, 2, 23; ĀpDhS. 1, 11, 32, 1. Otherwise, Renou, Écoles, p. 174.

[10] The original meaning is "interrogation": the pupil had to ask the teacher for instruction in definite subjects.

[11] BŚS. 18, 13: 357, 8ff.; Mbh. 13, 12; see Caland, in WZKM 17, 351.

[12] I refer to the table in chapter II, section 1.

[13] Called *iṣṭikalpa;* see also ĀpŚS. 19, 18–27; HŚS. 22, 3–14; Caland, A. Z. and Over de 'wenschoffers', Amsterdam Acad. 1902.

[14] For precise indications see the notes in Keith, V. B. Y. S., p. 223ff.

same material, which in the later *śrautasūtras* of the Taittirīyas is dealt with dispersedly in the descriptions of the sacrifices.

Thus, after beginning with a long quotation (five lines) from TS. 3, 1, 6, which in the middle is interrupted by a repetition of the injunction contained in the passage, BŚS. 14, 4 inserts some cross references on technical details—the Saṃhitā mentions a *mantra* and a number of predications of the type "Agni is the deity, *gāyatrī* the metre . . ."—; thereupon the following passage is quoted, and the injunction expressed in it repeated and elaborated.

After the chapters XVII and XVIII[15] *(uttarā tatiḥ)* of the Śrautasūtra there follows a chapter (XIX) called Kāṭhakam or Kāṭhakasūtra (Kāṭhakapraśna),[16] and dealing with the performance of *cayana* rites in accordance with the rules of the Kāṭhakas. Here ends the main part of the Śrautasūtra. The author, though treating the ritual of the Taittirīyas very faithfully, could not indeed escape contact with, and influence of, the Kāṭhaka recension and some other Vedic schools, among them that of the Kāṇvas.[17]

Whereas the different opinions of other authorities are in the other *sūtras* subjoined to the several views of the author and consequently dispersed over the text the compiler of the Baudhāyana-Sūtra has brought all this controversial matter together in the four chapters XX–XXIII, the so-called *dvaidhasūtra* ("on variant or different opinions"). The formulation is often somewhat emphatical: "this injunction is Śālīki's; Baudhāyana however has expressed the view . . ." The relations between the *dvaidha* and the main portions of the text are threefold. Often the opinion of Baudhāyana is adopted in the latter and different opinions are recorded in the former; or the point at issue is omitted in the main *sūtra* and all the opinions are noted in the *dvaidhasūtra*; or also the opinions are mentioned in the main *sūtra*, but the differences are shown in the *dvaidha*.[18] After this part of the book there follows, closely connected with the *dvaidhasūtra*, the so-called *karmāntasūtra* (XXIV–XXVI) which contains *pariśiṣṭas* (i.e. paralipomena, topics that were not sufficiently explained in the preceding chapters[19]). Caland had good reasons for supposing that the *dvaidha-* as well as the *karmāntasūtra*[20] are additions of material that, through dating back to the same period as the main text, was drawn up somewhat later, perhaps by a pupil. The *prāyaścitta* sections (XXVII–XXIX) are followed by the *śulbasūtra* (XXX) and the so-called *pravarasūtra* containing the stereotyped lists of names of ancient *ṛṣis* who are assumed to be the remote

[15] The numeration of the edition differs from that used in CALAND's "Über . . . Baudhāyana".

[16] For Kaṭha elements in TB. and TĀ. see GONDA, V. L., p. 350.

[17] For particulars see KASHIKAR, S. Ś., p. 47. Mention of the White Yajurveda has already been made in chapter I, 2; see also RENOU, Écoles, p. 174.

[18] Instances are BŚS. 1, 6: 20, 6; 20, 10 (the main *sūtra* being silent); 1, 19: 20, 14.

[19] Perhaps the compiler interpreted the term *karmānta* (for which see GONDA, S. S. II, p. 121). For *pariśiṣṭas* in general see also KASHIKAR, S. Bh. I, p. LXXXVII.

[20] Neither of them takes notice of the *sūtras* dealing with the *pravargya*, the *prāyaścitta* and the Kāṭhakam.

founders of brahmin families; these lists are recited at specific points in the sacrificial ritual.[21]

The next point to be considered is the unsystematic presentation of the subject-matter, no doubt also due to the compiler of the Taittirīya-Saṃhitā which is often followed rather closely.[22] In this the Śrautasūtra, notwithstanding a fairly uniform style and phraseology, contrasts with the orderly arrangement of other works of this class (e.g. Kātyāyana, Hiraṇyakeśin). For instance, in the beginning of 2, 6 the author explicitly assumes as known some topics which have not yet been dealt with. This peculiarity warrants the supposition that certain parts of the work have been replaced[23] and do not stand in the proper order as well as the hypothesis that the chapters and sections—or at least part of them—were for some time handed down in a more or less unarranged form and without numeration so that the 'editor', being puzzled how to restore order, made some mistakes in the final redaction of the *sūtra* work.[24] This hypothesis would also explain the uncertain order of part of the chapters of the Baudhāyana corpus[25] and the double numbering, based on tradition, of the *agniṣṭoma* and *uttara tatiḥ* portions. The work has moreover not been preserved in its complete form. The commentator Bhavasvāmin informs us of the loss, at an early date, of the so-called *kaukilī sautrāmaṇī*, a ritual which the followers of the Baudhāyana school perform in accordance with the ritual of the Āpastambīyas.[26]

In contradistinction to the other Taittirīya *sūtrakāras* Baudhāyana does not as a rule quote stanzas or *yajus* formulas *pratīkena*, but prefers to quote them in full[27] notwithstanding the fact that the Taittirīya-Saṃhitā was known to him in its present form.[28] Caland was inclined to regard this peculiarity as a characteristic of an orally transmitted *pravacana*, the literary genre to which this

---

[21] Cf. J. Brough, The early brahmanical system of gotra and pravara, Cambridge 1953.

[22] It is true that the order of the subjects dealt with is on the whole more practical and that some portions are based on the Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa. The *mantras* for the *pravargya* and their explanation are found in TĀ., chapters V and VI; in contradistinction to other works BŚS. places it after the *agniṣṭoma*. For deviations from TS. see also P. E. Dumont, L'aśvamedha, Paris and Louvain 1927, p. 327. (Had the author of BŚS. another text of TS. ?).

[23] Caland, Über . . . Baudhāyana, p. 8; Kashikar, in ABORI 29 (1948), p. 107 (on the *agnyādheya*, chapter II); in JGJRI 15 (1957—58), p. 155 (from the ritual point of view the order of the sections of book II should be 12; 1; 3—4; 2; 13—14; 8—11; 15—21); S. Ś., p. 45. The commentator Bhavasvāmin (8th century A.D.) was acquainted with the work in its present form.

[24] Differences in the order of some chapters occur also in some of the manuscripts. —Curiously enough, some parts of the work bear a special name (Caland, Über . . . Baudhāyana, p. 14).

[25] Cf. Caland, Über . . . Baudhāyana, p. 13.

[26] Cf. Caland, Über . . . Baudhāyana, p. 11; Kashikar, S. Ś., p. 46.

[27] Caland, Über . . . Baudhāyana, p. 10; in AO 2, p. 145.

[28] This appears for instance from BŚS. 10, 48: 48, 12ff. where some ***anuvākas*** (subdivisions) of the Saṃhitā (4, 5, 1—4) are enumerated in their regular **order.**

sūtra belongs. The *iṣṭis* are likewise described completely without any reference to parallel ritual acts that have already been mentioned in what precedes.[29]

Among the topics of interest which are not known from other works is a series of 72 formulas, called *pāpmano vinidhayaḥ* "removals ('depositions') of evil", in BŚS. 2, 5: "On the lion my wrath . . ., on the wolf my hunger etc.". In 2, 8 it is taught that the man who is going to establish his sacred fires has to perform the *gopitṛyajña*. One of the obligatory acts is gazing at his reflection in a pot filled with water at a crossroads and the recitation of these formulas.[30] By means of the formulas he directs his sins or deficiencies towards the beings or objects that are characterized by these lacks or evils.

The later *śrautasūtras* of the Taittirīyas—those of the Bhāradvāja, Āpastamba and Satyāṣāḍha-Hiraṇyakeśin schools—constitute one group: although Bhāradvaja is sometimes somewhat more concise, they are in the description of the rituals as well as style and vocabulary similar and in these and other respects widely different from Baudhāyana. Two of their common characteristics do not fail to strike even a superficial reader. They are less diffuse, more concise in wording and structure and—mainly as a result of the much more frequent references to and borrowings from other schools (their so-called eclecticism)—richer in contents.

As to the Bhāradvāja-Śrautasūtra,[31] the oldest of the three—the name of its author is at BhārGS. 3, 11 and in part of the commentaries on *śrautasūtras*, among them that of Dhūrtasvāmin, the oldest,[32] given as Bharadvāja, elsewhere as Bhāradvāja which, like Baudhāyana, is no doubt the patronymic name indicating the family and the school. From the commentaries it appears also that the Paitṛmedhika- and Pariśeṣasūtras enjoyed the same authority as the Śrautasūtra. Moreover, the commentators (mainly on Āpastamba and Hiraṇyakeśin) quote numerous passages from the Śrautasūtra which are not traced in the available text so that the conclusion is legitimate that they had a tradition (or traditions) of the Śrautasūtra before them which differed from that represented by the manuscripts extant.[33] A study of these quotations eads to the conclusion that the Śrautasūtra once contained also portions

[29] From this peculiarity also it appears that the Baudhāyana-Sūtra was composed at an early stage in the history of this class of literature: otherwise (the author intended to facilitate the task of those who studied the ritual), but unconvincingly A. Hillebrandt, in GGA 1903, p. 945; 946.

[30] See Caland, Über . . . Baudhāyana, p. 18; C. G. Kashikar, in IA 3, 3 (Volume R. N. Dandekar, 1969), p. 30 (on p. 35ff. text and translation); the same, in JUPHS 33 (1970), p. 39. For the rite compare also BDhS. 4, 7, 5—10 (purification in general).

[31] An incomplete edition (*praśnas* I—IX and a few sections of XII) was published by Raghu Vira in JVS 1 and 2, Lahore 1934—35 leaving the *jyotiṣṭoma* incomplete; a complete edition: C. G. Kashikar, The Śrauta, Paitṛmedhika and Pariśeṣa Sūtras of Bharadvāja, I Text, II Translation, Poona 1964 (with a long introduction on the manuscripts, the extant literature of the Bhāradvāja school, citations etc.). Cf. Kashikar, in ABORI 40, p. 56 and in Vol. L. Sarup, Hoshiarpur 1954, p. 41.

[32] Cf. Kashikar, S. Bh. I, p. XL.

[33] Cf. Kashikar, S. Bh. I, p. LI; for a list see p. 271.

which dealt with the *dākṣāyaṇa* sacrifice,[34] the optional animal sacrifices, the expiation rites belonging to the animal and *soma* sacrifices, and the *aśvamedha*.[35]

Bharadvāja does not describe the ritual as extensively as his predecessor Baudhāyana. Nor does he quote the *mantras* in full. While in the older *sūtra* work a *mantra* precedes an injunction, in the Bhāradvāja-Sūtra the order has been reversed. It quotes not only *mantras* from the basic texts of the Taittirīyas, but also from other recensions of the Yajurveda, among them more than forty from the Maitrāyaṇī-Saṃhitā, about that number from the Kāṭhaka-Saṃhitā and less than twenty from the Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā.[36] The followers of only one *brāhmaṇa* authority, viz. Kauṣītakin, are mentioned by name.[37] The treatment of the same subjects is not always similar in Baudhāyana and Bhāradvāja. None of the authorities mentioned by the former in the *dvaidhasūtra* occurs in the latter work. Instead it makes mention of several other teachers whose names are absent from the Baudhāyana-Sūtra. Most of the words peculiar to Baudhāyana are not found in the other manual.[38] A curious problem concerns the place of the *pravargya* rite in the latter[39] which differs from the position it occupies in the other works. This essentially independent ritual is, it is true, described in a separate section, but this section is included in the chapters on the *agniṣṭoma* (11, 1–16, followed by the expiatory rites belonging to it: 11, 17–20 and the *avāntaradīkṣā*, the subordinate or intermediate consecration[40] pertaining to it: 11, 21–22). The hypothesis that this was not the original position of the *pravargya* but that it was transferred to the *jyotiṣṭoma* for some practical reason—at 12, 2, 9 and 12, 6, 1 reference is made to it—is worth considering, also because the order of the chapters in some of the manuscripts leaving the *pravargya* without a number seems to point to the same conclusion.

In accordance with its title the Pariśeṣasūtra[41] is a supplement to the Śrautasūtra, only one topic—viz. the question of the cremation of an *āhitāgni* (an Aryan who maintains his sacred fires) either with the *śrauta* or with the domestic *(aupāsana)* fire[42] pertains to the *gṛhya* ritual. This text does not only supplement the prescripts of the Śrautasūtra; it furnishes also the *paribhāṣās*, which in the main *sūtra* are few in number. The *paribhāṣās* are to a large extent in agreement with those of Baudhāyana and Āpastamba.[43]

[34] A modification of the full and new moon rites, probably as performed in the Dākṣāyaṇa family. See CALAND, Ś. Ā. I, p. 98.

[35] For the supposition that some parts of BhŚS. have been lost see also KASHIKAR, in 19 AIOC (Delhi 1957), S. P., p. 8.

[36] KASHIKAR, S. Ś., p. 52.

[37] BhŚS. 10, 1, 8. Except Ālekhana and Āśmarathya names of other sources and authorities are absent too.

[38] See CALAND, Über . . . Baudhāyana, p. 57; KASHIKAR, S. Bh. I, p. LXXVIII.

[39] See KASHIKAR, S. Bh. I, p. LXXVII; LXXXI; S. Ś., p. 54.

[40] See J. A. B. VAN BUITENEN, The pravargya, Poona 1968, p. 137.

[41] See KASHIKAR, S. Bh. I, p. LXXXV; 255 (text); II, p. 502 (translation).

[42] Cf. CALAND, in WZKM 23, p. 58. References to the latter fire are however not rare in *śrautasūtras*, e.g. BhŚS. 11, 22, 14; ĀpŚS. 15, 21, 11.

[43] For details see KASHIKAR, S. Bh. I, p. LXXXVIII.

In modern times most of the Taittirīyas of South India are Āpastambins; of the others, the majority are followers of Baudhāyana, while a few belong to the schools of Bharadvāja or Hiraṇyakeśin.[44] In all probability the Āpastambins lived there anciently in close proximity to the followers of the Bhāradvāja school, because their texts are nearly related.

The Śrautasūtras of Bharadvāja and Āpastamba,[45] who probably[46] flourished a little later, are indeed similar in style, structure and—except for a few details—the order of the subjects treated as well as ritualistic particulars; even the wording of the individual rules—though now and then ampler or somewhat curious in Āpastamba—is in both works often identical.[47] However, Āpastamba joins Baudhāyana in placing the *mantras* before the injunctions. He quotes more authorities[48] than Bharadvāja, often also the views of Āśmarathya and Ālekhana. Among the numerous (over 200) places recording the views of *eke* there are no doubt many indirect quotations from the Bhāradvāja-Sūtra.[49] He also refers more frequently to *brāhmaṇas*. The Vājasaneyins and a Vājasaneyakam (sc. *brāhmaṇam*) are more than fifty times mentioned, but only a few of these references are in the same form found in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa; many of them do not occur there at all, or are even contradicted by this work or Kātyāyana's Sūtra.[50] Did Āpastamba quote inaccurately?; did he mention the White Yajurveda *honoris causa*?; was he in possession of another recension of their text or were the references borrowed from a secondary source lost to us? The extent to which the *brāhmaṇas* of the Ṛgveda have influenced his work does not seem to reach beyond those places where the "Brāhmaṇa of the Bahvṛcas"[51] is directly quoted; though similar to the Kauṣītaki-Brāhmaṇa the

---

[44] B. V. Kāmeśvara Aiyar, in QJMS 13, p. 526.

[45] The Śrauta Sūtra of Āpastamba . . . with the commentary of Rudradatta, ed. by R. Garbe, Calcutta (B.I.), I, 1882; II, 1885; III, 1902; the *praśnas* I—X were edited by S. Narasimhachar and T. T. Srinivasagopalacharya, Āpastambīyaṃ Śrautasūtram with the *bhāṣya* of Dhūrtasvāmin and the *vṛtti* of Rāmāgnicit, Mysore, I, 1945; II, 1954; III, 1960 (see also C. G. Kashikar, in IIJ 13, p. 95); likewise incomplete: Āpastambaśrautasūtra Dhūrtasvāmibhāṣya, ed. by A. Chinnaswāmī Śāstrī 1955; 1963 (up to *praśna* IX incl.); *praśna* IX and X by Śrinivāsarāghavāchārya, Mysore 1960; translation: W. Caland, Das Śrautasūtra des Āpastamba I (*praśna* I—VII), Göttingen and Leipzig 1921; II (VIII—XV) and III (XVI—XXIV; XXXI), Amsterdam Acad. 1924; 1928 (cf. H. Oertel, in ZII 8, p. 281); reprint of vol. II and III in two volumes (I and II), Wiesbaden 1969; translation of *praśna* XV *(pravargya)* also R. Garbe, in ZDMG 34, p. 319.

[46] But see Renou, Écoles, p. 175.

[47] See also Kashikar, S. Bh., I, p. LXXIX. Compare for instance the practically identical chapters ĀpŚS. 9, 1 and BhŚS. 9, 1; 2.

[48] See also R. Garbe, in Festgabe Weber, Leipzig 1896, p. 33; Kashikar, S. Ś., p. 58.

[49] But the view of the *eke* in BhŚS. 10, 6, 9 is found at ĀpŚS. 10, 10, 4 (cf. KS. 23, 4: 79, 14); for BhŚS. 10, 13, 5 cf. ĀpŚS. 10, 3, 1.

[50] Cf. Eggeling, ŚB. I, p. XXXIX and especially Caland, in ZDMG 58, p. 508; cf. also Renou, Écoles, p. 176.

[51] See Gonda, V. L., p. 30. Cf. e.g. ĀpŚS. 12, 17, 2.

text used by Āpastamba was not identical with that work.[52] Besides adapted injunctions there are in his *sūtras* modified *mantras*[53] and even *mantras* from other recensions when the Taittirīyas possessed formulas for a definite ritual.[54] Among the foreign elements is, here again, Kaṭha ritual, notably the *cayana* in 19, 11–15.[55] Cases are not even wanting in which the author contradicts the statements of his own *brāhmaṇa*.[56] So, though composed by a loyal Taittirīya this Śrautasūtra cannot be said to be a wholly pure source of information on the ritual practices of this school;[57] it is not, as has often been taken for granted, the model of a Taittirīya manual. On the contrary, an inquiry into the complicated relations between this *sūtra* and its basic texts is still a desideratum.[58]

As to the subjects dealt with in the work, mention is still to be made of chapter XXIV, the second part of which (5–11) contains the *pravaras*, the first the *paribhāṣās*. The latter, which are also of some use to those who study the Gṛhyasūtra, have also been published separately.[59]

The Śrautasūtra of Hiraṇyakeśin[60]—this name, possibly belonging to the school, has long been usual in the West—and Āpastamba's work are so closely related that many of their *sūtras* are word for word identical—no doubt one of the reasons of the state of neglect in which the former continues.[61] Part of the injunctions however agree with the Bhāradvāja-Sūtra rather than Āpastamba.[62] A close relationship with the Bhāradvāja school is also apparent from the

---

[52] A. B. KEITH, in JRAS 1915, p. 493; RENOU, Écoles, p. 40.—For the *hautram* in ĀpŚS. 24, 11–14 see C. G. KASHIKAR, in I. A. 3, 1, p. 87; S. Ś., p. 59.

[53] Cf. also RENOU, Écoles, p. 176, n. 5.

[54] See CALAND's note on ĀpŚS. 8, 16, 10 (Ś. Ā. II, p. 55).

[55] For particulars see CALAND, S. Ā. III, p. 183; RENOU, Écoles, p. 177. Cf. also ĀpŚS. 21, 23, 6ff.

[56] ĀpŚS. 5, 3, 16 (following MS. 1, 68: 100, 3 and 11; otherwise TB. 1, 1, 2, 8); 6, 6, 4; 11, 2, 6; 13, 20, 11 with Caland's notes. Curiously enough Āpastamba's (and Hiraṇyakeśin's) *eke* sometimes refers to the TB. (see CALAND, on ĀpŚS. 9, 8, 4; 12, 4, 2: 20, 7, 6; 20, 10, 8; 21, 23, 2ff.); B. FADDEGON (in Museum 30, p. 12) was no doubt mistaken in explaining this peculiarity from the posteriority of the Brāhmaṇa in the 'course of this school'.

[57] Cf. CALAND, Ś. Ā. I, p. 3.

[58] Cf. CALAND, Ś. Ā. III, p. 4.

[59] Yajñaparibhāṣā-Sūtra, ed. by S. SĀMAŚRAMĪ, in Uṣā 1 (1891); The Āpastamba-Paribhāṣāsūtra, with the commentaries of Kapardisvāmin and Haradattācārya, ed. by A. MAHĀDEVA ŚĀSTRĪ, Mysore 1894; English translation by H. OLDENBERG, S. B. E. XXX, p. 311. For the *sādyaḥkra* (ĀpŚS. 22, 2, 6ff. etc.), i.e. *soma* sacrifice which in one day includes all the ritual acts see K. MYLIUS, in Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung 17 (Berlin 1972), p. 578.

[60] Satyāṣāḍhaviracitaṃ Śrautasūtram, with Mahādeva's commentary Vaijayantī ed. by KĀŚĪNĀTHAŚĀSTRĪ ĀGĀŚE and ŚAṄKARAŚĀSTRĪ MĀRŪLAKARA, 10 vol., Poona 1907–1932 (uncritical and full of mistakes). A translation does not exist.

[61] V. V. BHIDE, A critical study of the cāturmāsya sacrifices with special referenceto the Hiraṇyakeśin-Śrautasūtra, Thesis Poona 1969 (typescript) is not accessible to me.

[62] E.g. HŚS. 1, 4–6: BhŚS. 1, 24–26; HŚS. 15, 1, 48–50: BhŚS. 9, 4, 1; for other parallels see KASHIKAR, S. Bh. I, p. LXXXIV, n. 2. For influence of KS. and MS. see V. V. BHIDE, in 21 AIOC, S. P. 1961, p. 17; in OT 6 (1962), p. 8.

adoption, by the followers of Satyāṣāḍha, of the Bhāradvāja-Pitṛmedhika-Sūtra. There are also sections where the compiler in composing his work seems to have followed his own devices: in contradistinction to his predecessors the *pravargya* is placed at the end of the Śrautasūtra, but what is more remarkable, the Gṛhyasūtra, constituting the chapters XIX and XX of the whole corpus, is inserted in the discussion of the solemn rites between the *sattras* and the *hautra*, with the result that the Dharmasūtra (XXVI and XXVII) is separated from the domestic manual. Yet, tradition has it that Hiraṇyakeśin "belongs to", or "is included in" Āpastamba *(āpastambāntargataḥ)*, but it is not clear whether this expression points to a split in the older school.

In the twenties of the present century Caland became acquainted with manuscripts[63] of writings of the Vādhūla school which, though long regarded as extinct, survives in a few persons.[64] The Vādhūla *gotra* belonging to the Yāska Bhṛgus is mentioned in several inscriptions.[65] According to a commentary (the *vyākhyā*) there existed four subdivisions of this school, viz. the Kauṇḍinyas, Āgniveśyas,[66] Gālavas, and Śāṅkhas.[67] Contrary to the tradition according to which Vādhūla was younger than Āpastamba and Hiraṇyakeśin,[68] Āpastamba is in an introductory stanza of the *prayoga* which forms part of the school's inheritance said to have been the pupil of a pupil of Vādhūla and therefore by two generations his junior.[69] The distance of time may even have been longer because it is clear that Vādhūla must have belonged to the earliest Taittirīya *sūtrakāras*. His *śrauta* work is more closely related to Baudhāyana's than the other *sūtras* of the Black Yajurveda are. Like Baudhāyana Vādhūla quotes the *mantras in extenso*[70] and discusses each *iṣṭi* separately without cross references; the two manuals have ritual, phraseological and grammatical peculiarities in common.[71] It has even—not unjustly—been surmised[72] that

[63] For particulars now see M. Witzel, in SII 1 (1975), p. 75.

[64] E. R. S. Sarma, quoted by Witzel, op. cit., p. 77. According to J. F. Staal, Nambudiri Veda recitation, The Hague 1961, p. 62 about 10% of the Nambudiri Taittirīyakas in Kerala are Vādhūlakas (who have given up the oral tradition of their texts), about 90% Baudhāyanas.

[65] Caland, in AO 1, p. 7; 4, p. 5; L. A. Ravi Varma, Āgniveśyagṛhyasūtra, Trivandrum 1940, p. III; Kashikar, S. Ś., p. 66.

[66] See p. 593 below.

[67] Cf. also Witzel, op. cit., p. 95.

[68] See p. 482 above.

[69] Caland, in AO 1, p. 7; Ravi Varma, l. cit. N. Tsuji, in Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko 19, Tokyo 1960, p. 43 could reconstruct the following succession of teachers: Saubabhruva, Vādhūla, Agniveśya, Āpastamba.

[70] See Caland, in AO 2, p. 144; 146. Curiously enough Vādhūla mentions the ritual act between the *pratīka* and the rest of the *mantra*, e.g. *āpa undantu jīvasa ity / asya dakṣiṇaṃ godānam unatti / dirghāyutvāya varcasa iti* (TS. 1, 2, 1a).

[71] Although Vādhūla mentions also rituals which do not occur elsewhere; see e.g. Caland, in AO 4, p. 163; 165; 166 etc.—Cf. e.g. Caland, in AO 4, p. 178; 179; 181; 184 etc.; P. E. Dumont, L'aśvamedha, Paris and Louvain 1927, p. IX; Caland, in AO 2, p. 155.

[72] Caland, in AO 2, p. 146.

Vādhūla flourished at a somewhat earlier time than Baudhāyana of whom he is—as far as can be seen now—wholly independent.[73] This hypothesis is in harmony with his style which creates the impression of being comparatively archaic[74] as well as with the position of the probably oldest parts of his corpus in relation to other works. These oldest parts, the *anvākhyānas*, are later than the Taittirīya-Saṃhitā and Brāhmaṇa which they cite, but probably somewhat earlier than the oldest *upaniṣads* which they now and then foreshadow and to which they bear, in terminology used, some resemblance.[75] Other portions[76] are perhaps contemporaneous with those younger *brāhmaṇas* which discuss *inter alia* the problem how to ward off repeated death.[77]

From the fact that Vādhūla on one hand seems to presuppose that his 'readers' were acquainted with the two basic texts of the Taittirīyas and on the other hand deviates from these works—he has also *mantras* of his own—it has been inferred[78] that he did not adhere to the Taittirīya-Saṃhitā but to some other basic text that was closely related to it. This autonomy—which has not yet been clearer determined—would not be the only peculiarity of the Vādhūla corpus. Though entitling the work Vādhūla-Sūtra Caland did not fail to observe that many of the fragments which he published[79] were *brāhmaṇa*like or even hybrid texts characterized by the occurrence of justifications, legends, archaisms, the absence of *sūtra*like phraseology and differing from the *brāhmaṇas* known to us mainly by the presence of more *vidhis*.[80] As a matter of fact the work is a combination of a *śrautasūtra*—chapter I–XI (*agnyādheya*, *punarādheya*, *agnihotra*, *agnyupasthāna* etc. in I; *puroḍāśī* (oblations of ground rice offered on such occasions as the new moon sacrifices etc.) in II; *yajamāna*, *āgrayaṇa*, *brahmatva* in III; *cāturmāsyas* in IV; animal sacrifice in V; *jyotiṣṭoma* in VI and VII (without the *pravargya*); *agnicayana* in VIII; *vājapeya* in IX; *rājasūya* with *sautrāmaṇi* in X; *aśvamedha* in XI)—and a *brāhmaṇa* (chapter XII–XV or XVIff.?).[81] This second part[82] dealing with *agnyādheya*, *agnihotra*, *paśubandha*, *agniṣṭoma*, *agnicayana*, and *prāyaścittas* and written

[73] Caland, in AO 2, p. 147.

[74] For particulars see Caland, in AO 1, p. 9.

[75] Cf. Caland in AO 4, p. 159; 6, p. 121; 153; 194; 222; 232 etc.

[76] A fragment of the *pitṛmedhasūtra*; see Witzel, op. cit., p. 80.

[77] Cf. Witzel, op. cit., p. 93; on the use of the narrative perfect in the *anvākhyānas*, the same, p. 94.

[78] Caland, in AO 2, p. 143; 145; 4, p. 2; cf. Witzel, op. cit., p. 94.

[79] Caland published parts of this work in four articles in AO 1, p. 3 (on some accessary texts, *inter alia* a commentary *(vyākhyā)* from which the *sūtra* cannot be reconstructed); 2, p. 142 (*prapāṭhakas* (chapters) I–VI and part of VII); 4, p. 1; 161 (VII–XI); 6, p. 97 (extensive parts of the *anvākhyāna*). M. Witzel (cf. op. cit., p. 96) is preparing a complete edition.

[80] Caland, in AO 2, p. 146; 4, p. 3; 5; 41; cf. also Renou, Écoles, p. 179. There even are pseudo-etymologies (as in the *brāhmaṇas* etc.): Caland, in AO 6, p. 110f.; 121.

[81] Cf. Caland, in AO 1, p. 4; Witzel, op. cit., p. 78.

[82] Cf. Caland, in AO 4, p. 2ff.; Witzel, op. cit., p. 82.

in "very correct *brāhmaṇa* style" is known as *anvākhyāna* "explanation on subjects dealt with before". It is the only instance of a secondary *brāhmaṇa (anubrāhmaṇa)* composed and handed down beside an ancient work of the same class. Although it is a question whether these *anvākhyānas* reflect a previous hybrid Vādhūla composition or originally constituted a separate part of the *sūtra* work, these chapters were probably known to our *sūtrakāra*[83] from some source. Bearing in the presentation of part of their subjects[84] a more or less strong resemblance to the Śatapatha- and (sometimes) the Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇas the *anvākhyānas*—so remarkable because of their circumstantial motivations in fully developed *brāhmaṇa* style—are no doubt like the *dvaidha-* and *karmānta-sūtras* in the Baudhāyana corpus[85] and the observations ascribed to such figures as Āśmarathya and Ālekhana, the products of a continued discussion of and speculation on ritual problems. They seem to represent some second thoughts of the Taittirīyas and their reactions to other schools in order to uphold their own position.[86]

Another peculiarity attesting to the comparative autonomy of this school is the incorporation of a collection of complete *mantras*—quoted *pratīkena* in the text—which does not only comprise formulas for the domestic rites—in this the Vādhūlas are not alone—but also *yajus* formulas for the solemn ceremonies.[87]

Reserving the history of the interesting religious community of the Vaikhānasas for consideration in the chapter on the domestic manuals because their *smārta-* (*gṛhya-* and *dharma-*) *sūtra* is much more remarkable than their *śrauta* work I confine my observations on this text[88]—also known as Aukheyasūtra[89]—to the following. This *sūtra* is in all probability the last of the whole series of manuals of *śrauta* rites. It is written in simple style, stylistically somewhat

---

[83] CALAND, in AO 4, p. 5.

[84] See the fragments published by CALAND, in AO 4, p. 6; 6, p. 67; 101.

[85] For correspondences, differences etc.: CALAND, in AO 4, p. 166; p. 178; 179; 184; 188; 192; 193; 196; 6, p. 188; 192. For points of ritual interest see e.g. AO 4, p. 163; 166; 171.

[86] H. W. BODEWITZ, The daily evening and morning offering *(agnihotra)* according to the brāhmaṇas, Leiden 1976, p. 6.

[87] See CALAND, in AO 4, p. 2. See also KASHIKAR, S. Ś., p. 66; 67; WITZEL, op. cit., p. 84. Among these formulas are the *pāpmano vinidhayaḥ*; see p. 518 above.

[88] Vaikhānasa-Śrautasūtram, (posthumously) ed. by W. CALAND, Calcutta 1941; this edition is followed by RAGHU VIRA, Mantra-Index to Vaikhānasa-Śrautasūtra.

[89] This name appears in one of the introductory stanzas of the commentary *(vyākhyā)* on the Śrautasūtra and in the Ānanda-Saṃhitā (see GONDA, M. R. L., p. 144), 8, 13 and 28. Aukheya is said to be another name for Vaikhānasa. The—not very reliable—Caraṇavyūha (see GONDA, V. L., p. 31 etc.), while being silent on the Vaikhānasas, says that the Taittirīyakas split up into Aukheyas and Khāṇḍikeyas, the latter surviving in five groups, viz. Kāletās, Śāṭyāyanis, Hairaṇyakeśas, Bhāradvājas, Āpastambins. According to colophons the Śrautasūtra is either composed by Aukheya, or belongs to his *śākhā* and was proclaimed by Vikhanas. The latter name occurs in the text only in a later addition. Did the name Aukheya also apply to the other parts of the Vaikhānasa corpus ? See CALAND, Preface to the edition, p. XXV and RENOU, Écoles, p. 132; GONDA, V. L., p. 324.

below the traditional standard, grammatically not wholly correct, and handed down in manuscripts that are in many places very corrupt. The hypothesis that it has been completed after the very late Smārtasūtra—while perhaps being in the making simultaneously—has much to recommend it.[90] It has even been surmised that the Śrautasūtra—which abounds in borrowings from Baudhāyana, Āpastamba and Hiraṇyakeśin—owes its existence to the wish of the community to establish itself as a regular Vedic *śākhā*.[91] Although it is not very original it contains some descriptions[92] that are not found in other works of this class. It is complete, but some rituals are missing, for instance the *aśvamedha*, notwithstanding a reference to this sacrifice in 20, 35.[93] It begins, not with the rites of full and new moon (III–VII), but with the *agnyādheya* (I) and the *agnihotra*.[94] The *mantras*, a considerable part of which, also when quoted *pratīkena*, is not found in the basic texts of the Taittirīyas, presuppose the availability of a special Mantra-Saṃhitā for *śrauta* purposes[95] which indeed exists though in an incomplete form.[96] The question as to whether the Vaikhānasas had also a *brāhmaṇa* of their own—some references to a *brāhmaṇa* cannot be traced in the books of the Taittirīyas—has not yet been answered.[97] One of the most striking peculiarities of the work is its obvious allegiance to Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa;[98] Viṣṇuism is not less evident in the Smārtasūtra.

To the Maitrāyaṇī recension of the Kṛṣṇa-Yajurveda belong two Śrautasūtras, Mānava and Vārāha.[99] Although the former[100] contains a few passages

[90] CALAND (Vaikhānasasmārtasūtram, English translation, Calcutta 1929, p. XII; Preface VaikhŚS., p. XXII) was convinced of the priority of the Smārtasūtra, because of the numbering of the chapters (ŚS. 12–32, SmS. 1–10) and of cross-references (SmS. 3, 6: ŚS. 20, 4; at 20, 22 the ŚS. presupposes the existence of SmS. 5, 12; the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* is described in full in SmS. 4, 5f. and only mentioned in ŚS. 3, 6); some indications to the contrary (SmS. 1, 8: ŚS. 9, 7–11; SmS. 9, 3: ŚS. 1, 2ff.) had little weight with him. Otherwise A. B. KEITH, in BSOS 5, p. 923. Because of noticeable differences in style both works are probably not composed by the same author.

[91] Cf. RENOU, Écoles, p. 180.

[92] VaikhŚS. 1, 1 (fire-drill); 1, 1f. (the *kuṇḍas*, i.e. places for the sacrificial fire); 11, 7–10 the ritual utensils; 19, 3 (the seven Vaikhānasa bricks in the great fire-place).

[93] This reference may have crept in from BŚS. 28, 6: 354, 11.

[94] See KASHIKAR, S. Ś., p. 62.

[95] It presupposes the Mantra-Saṃhitā for the *grhya* rites.

[96] For details: CALAND, Preface VaikhŚS., p. XIV.

[97] Cf. VaikhŚS. 2, 6; 8, 1; 9, 12; 18, 1. See CALAND, Preface VaikhŚS., p. XVI. Ānanda-S. 1, 78, distinguishing a Vaikhānasam from the Taittirīyam and the Vājasaneyakam, may suggest answering the question in the affirmative.

[98] Cf. VaikhŚS. 1, 4: 1, 14; 2, 5; 3, 1; 4, 4; 12, 10; 18, 20: 278, 16; 20, 1; 21, 18; cf. also 2, 6 (the Viṣṇuite *puṇḍra*).

[99] Among the Maitrāyaṇīyas there were Mānavas, Vārāhas and others; see GONDA, V. L., p. 324.

[100] The Mānava Śrauta Sūtra, belonging to the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, ed. by JEANNETTE M. VAN GELDER, New Delhi 1961 (cf. KASHIKAR, S. Ś., p. 121). Partial editions: F. KNAUER, Das Mānava-Śrauta-Sūtra, Buch I–V, 3 fascicles, St. Peters-

which remind us of the *brāhmaṇa* style[101] it should by no means[102] be characterized as a descriptive work nearly related to that class of literature and as the most ancient of its genre.[103] There are no legends, discussions or speculations,[104] and the work is on the whole written in a succinct and compact *sūtra* style.[105]

The contents of the eleven chapters are the following:[106] *prāksoma* (I), *agniṣṭoma* (II); *prāyaścittas* (III); *pravargya* (IV); *iṣṭis* (V); *agnicayana* (VI); *vājapeya* (VII); supplements parts of which do not belong to a *śrautasūtra* (VIII); *rājasūya*,[107] *aśvamedha*, *soma* sacrifices of one day, longer *soma* rites (IX); chapter X comprises the *śulbasūtra* and (10, 3) the so-called *vaiṣṇavam* or "measuring (of the ground where the great fireplace is to be erected) for Viṣṇu", XI some later additions (expiations, various other rites,[108] *śrāddha*). From information given in colophons it may be inferred that the nucleus of the work consists of five parts, viz. the *prāksoma*, the *agniṣṭoma*, the *iṣṭikalpa*, the *vājapeya* and the *cayana*. The *pravargya* etc. are probably additions.

The author has known the Maitrāyaṇī-Saṃhitā in its present form. There are some traces of the influence exerted by the Kaṭhas upon other schools. Most interesting are the many striking parallels with Āśvalāyana's *sūtra* work which can in many places be utilized as a commentary on the more condensed Mānava Sūtra.[109] A study of part of these places led Caland to the conclusion that Āpastamba and Hiraṇyakeśin were acquainted with both the Vārāha and Mānava Śrautasūtras. Now the complete Mānava text has been edited the problem of these interrelations needs reconsidering.

---

burg 1900—1903 (compare CALAND's reviews in GGA 1902, p. 122; 1904, p. 243); J. M. VAN GELDER, Mānava Śrauta-sūtra cayana (= Hoogaltaar) Thesis Utrecht 1919, ²Leiden 1921 (ch. VI, 1 and 2). The Mānava Kalpasūtra edited by TH. GOLDSTÜCKER, London 1861 is no *śrauta* work but an incorrect copy of a commentary on the *adhyāyas* 1—7 of the *prāksoma* (chapter I, cf. v. BRADKE, in ZDMG 36, p. 448). Translation: The Mānava Śrautasūtra translated by J. M. v. GELDER, New Delhi 1963.

[101] See however KEITH, in JRAS 1909, p. 591.

[102] With GARBE, Āpastamba Śrautasūtra, I, p. XXII; L. v. SCHROEDER, Indiens Literatur und Cultur, Leipzig 1887 (1922), p. 194.

[103] CALAND, in GGA 1904, p. 249 was inclined to include it among the younger *śrautasūtras*, though elsewhere (in AO 9, 70; cf. ArchRel. 11, p. 129), he thought it older than ĀpŚS.

[104] For some occasional definitions, explanations or references see 5, 2, 14, 23; 1, 2, 1, 34; 4, 1, 4.

[105] The manuscripts and commentaries are often in a bad condition.

[106] For a detailed survey see v. GELDER, Translation, p. 11.

[107] N. TSUJI, Notes on the Rājasūya-section (9, 1) of the MŚS., in Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko, 23 (1964), p. 1 and 25 (1967), p. 121 studies *inter alia* the relation between MŚS. (VŚS.) and MS.

[108] Among these (in 11, 7) an interesting rite requiring the murmuring of the *śatarudriya* (VS. 16 etc.); see J. GONDA, in the prospective Volume Ingalls.

[109] For a discussion: v. GELDER, Hoogaltaar, p. XI; CALAND, On the relative chronology of some ritualistic sūtras, AO 9, p. 69.

Nearly related to the Mānava is the Vārāha-Śrautasūtra.[110] Though rich in contents it is much more condensed than the former and not free from lacunae. In the edition and in the manuscripts discovered so far it lacks inter alia chapters on the *agniṣṭoma*, *pravargya*, *iṣṭikalpa* and *prāyaścitta*. The edition comprises three chapters entitled Prāksaumikam (an incomplete *prāksoma*); Agnicayanam, Vājapeyādikam.[111] Many solemn rites, even topics that occur in the Saṃhitā, are treated as *pariśiṣṭas* and partly incorporated in the Gṛhyasūtra.[112] The work creates the impression of having been recast or having enjoyed a certain independence from the beginning. In spite of some minor discrepancies it is faithful to the Maitrāyaṇī-Saṃhitā,[113] but it is more at variance with the Taittirīya schools than Mānava and has more foreign *mantras*.[114]

The important school of the Kaṭhas has at an early date suffered serious losses.[115] Of a *brāhmaṇa* and an *āraṇyaka* we possess no more than some fragments. In his introduction to the Laugākṣi-Gṛhyasūtra Devapāla[116] informs us that the Kāṭhaka-Śrautasūtra consisted of thirty-nine chapters *(adhyāya)*. Unfortunately of this no doubt voluminous and important work only a few fragments are available at present.[117] Among these is a description of the *divaḥśyeni iṣṭis*[118] and a text on the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*.[119] Some elements of this *sūtra* could, moreover, be 'reconstructed' with the help of the Kāṭhaka-Saṃhitā (Kāṭhakam).[120] There is evidence of some kind of literary collaboration of this school and the sāmavedic Kauthumās.[121]

---

[110] Vārāha-Śrauta-Sūtra, edited by W. CALAND and RAGHU VIRA, Lahore 1933 (1934), ²Delhi 1971 (based on a bad and disordered manuscript; see also KASHIKAR, S. Ś., p. 75 and in ALB 25 (1961), p. 229; in Vimarśa, Tirupati 1968 and 1972; in Vol. Kaviraj, p. 14; in Vol. Raghavan, p. 193).—There still are some brahmin families which belong to this school.

[111] For 3, 2, the *sautrāmaṇi* and its text, see C. G. KASHIKAR, in JBBRAS 26, p. 10.

[112] Enumerated in VārGS. 1, 1, translated by ROLLAND, R. D. V., p. 53; see also p. 16. On the *rahasya* (*pariśiṣṭa* 12): P. ROLLAND, in JA 1969, p. 267.—See also GONDA, V. L., p. 327, n. 39.

[113] While calling the MŚS. Mānavamaitrāyaṇi Hemādri uses the name Maitrāyaṇisūtra for the Vārāha (RENOU, Écoles, p. 182, n. 1).

[114] See also CALAND, in AO 9, p. 69.

[115] See RENOU, in JA 236, p. 128; GONDA, V. L., p. 326; 430. On other lost texts see RENOU, Écoles, p. 147; WEBER, I. L., p. 110.

[116] See The Laugākṣi-Gṛhya-sūtras with the bhāshyam of Devapāla, ed. M. KAUL, I, Bombay 1928, p. 1.

[117] Published in SURYAKANTA, Kāṭhaka-Śrautasūtra-Saṃkalanam, Lahore 1943. A hundred or two quotations from this Śrautasūtra were collected and published by RAGHU VIRA in the Oriental College Magazine, Univ. of Panjab, Lahore 1928.

[118] Which occur also in TB. 3, 12, 2; ĀpŚS. 19, 15, 17f.; see CALAND, Ś. Ā. III, p. 196. The fragment has been published by RAGHU VIRA, in JVS 2 (1935), p. 104.

[119] Published by CALAND, Ahnenkult, p. 212; cf. p. 67, and translated in Śrautakośa, I, Engl. section, I, p. 532.

[120] N. FUKUSHIMA, A collection of the sūtra elements from the Kāthakam, Comm. Vol. Science of Religion, Imp. Univ., Tokyo 1934, p. 243.

[121] See PARPOLA, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 93.

In the comparatively late Kātyāyana (sometimes Kātīya)-Śrautasūtra[122] the genre is said to have reached its culmination.[123] Notwithstanding its excellence as a *sūtra* text and its uniqueness as the only *śrauta* work of the White Yajurveda it has been somewhat neglected. Aiming at completeness it deals successively with the *paribhāṣās* (I),[124] full and new moon sacrifices (II and III), *piṇḍapitṛyajña, dākṣāyaṇa* etc., *āgrayaṇa, agnyādheya, agnihotra* (IV); *cāturmāsyas* (four-monthly sacrifices, V); animal sacrifice (VI); *agniṣṭoma* (VII–XI); ritual of twelve days' duration (XII); *gavām ayana* (XIII); *vājapeya* (XIV); *rājasūya* (XV); *agnicayana* (XVI–XVIII); *sautrāmaṇī* (XIX); *aśvamedha* (XX); *puruṣamedha, sarvamedha, pitṛmedha* (XXI); *ekāhas* (rites that last one day, XXII), the *ahīnas* (rites of two to twelve days, XXIII and XXIV); *prāyaścittas* (XXV); *pravargya* (XXVI).[125]

From this survey it will be clear that Kātyāyana[126] has with some exceptions followed the Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā and the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa in the methodical arrangement of the rituals dealt with[127] and formulated his rules in agreement with these basic texts.[128] Thus KŚS. II–XVIII are based on ŚB. I–IX; XIX and XXV on ŚB. XII and XX and XXI on ŚB. XIII. However, in order to furnish the officiants with a comprehensive manual the author has borrowed additional material from other sources. Many passages of the *adhyāyas* XXII–XXIV, for which the Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā could not furnish the material, run parallel with the Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa.[129] The author has moreover inserted

---

[122] The Śrautasūtra of Kātyāyana with extracts from the commentaries of Karka and Yājñikadeva, ed. by A. Weber, Berlin 1859, ²Varanasi 1972; Kātyāyana Śrautasūtra with a commentary by Śrī Karkācārya, ed. by V. P. Madanamohan Pāṭhaka, Benares 1903—1908; Śrautasūtram of Kātyāyana, ed. by V. Sarma, Benares 1931—1933. See K. P. Singh, A critical study of the Kātyāyana-Śrautasūtra, Varanasi 1969.

[123] Renou, in JA 233, p. 114; cf. Écoles, p. 183.

[124] Being placed at the beginning these general rules are very helpful in performing the rituals and studying the book.

[125] For the deities and sacrifices occurring in the book see Bh. Mishra, in Sarasvatī-Suṣamā 14 (Varanasi 1961), p. 45. For the Śulbasūtra, which is the 7th *pariśiṣṭa* in Kātyāyana's Śrautasūtra, and its commentaries see S. L. Katre, in 13 AIOC, II (Nagpur 1951), p. 72.

[126] On questions of identity, authorship, date etc. see also Singh, op. cit., p. 5.

[127] Compare Gonda, V. L., p. 328; 351. For some exceptions (e.g. KŚS. a. VII precedes VI and part of V in the order corresponding with VS. IV) see Renou, Écoles, p. 183, n. 3 and Singh, op. cit., p. 60 who draws attention to some differences between KŚS. and ŚB. in the order of the description of individual sacrifices (e.g. KŚS. 10, 2, 6—8; 10, 3, 10—11: ŚB. 4, 3, 4, 10—13; 4, 3, 3, 15—19).

[128] See also Weber, I. L.,² p. 155; A. Hillebrandt, Das altindische Neu- und Vollmondsopfer, Jena 1880, p. VI; Singh, op. cit., p. 43; 60. For a discrepancy: P. E. Dumont, L'aśvamedha, Paris and Louvain 1927, p. 159.

[129] For a survey see Singh, op. cit., p. 53 who is convinced that Kātyāyana was for these supplements indebted to that work. Or did he (like PB.) draw on a text that is lost to us ? For influence of the LŚS. in the last parts of KŚS. see Parpola, Ś. L. D., I, 1, p. 94.

a few *kāmyeṣṭis*,[130] a subject that is not dealt with in the Saṃhitā. He has further borrowed some elements from Baudhāyana—they have these elements at least in common[131]—, also even in cases in which the other manuals of the Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda differ from this authority.[132] He has not however joined Baudhāyana in including topics that do not properly belong to the *śrauta* ritual. But in contradistinction to the work of the latter his book—that, while possibly avoiding monotony, is written in a more refined, uniform and systematic *sūtra* style—lacks any *brāhmaṇa*like passages. Although the *mantras* that are common to the Mādhyandinas and the Kāṇvas[133] are always mentioned in the form preferred by the former there are about twenty *mantras* which belong to the Kāṇva recension. These are however cited *in extenso* and in the order of the Saṃhitā.[134] Unlike the other *sūtrakāras*[135] Kātyāyana likes to insert justifications of the ritual procedures enjoined, to enter into a discussion of their pros and cons, and to clothe these in the form of grammatical *vārttikas* (remarks on the teaching procedures, supplementary explanations). Since the relevant passages clearly foreshadow, and occasionally even seem to reflect, the methods of arguing that prevailed in the Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā[136]—the work contains also many technical terms used in that school of exegetics (e.g. *tantra* in 1, 7, 1), treats the order of the sacrificial procedure (*krama*, 1, 5) systematically in a way that reminds the reader of the Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā, and clothes arguments in sentences with the noun expressing the cause in the ablative—the conclusion has been drawn that the *sūtrakāra* "availed himself of the style and phraseology of Jaimini's Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā-Sūtra".[137] As this manual does not seem to date back further than about A.D. 200 we should rather say that the *sūtrakāra* was acquainted with the work of Jaimini's predecessors.[138] He may have belonged to the same family as the famous author of the *vārttikas* on Pāṇini, his namesake who, being in all probability identical with the author of the Vājasaneyi-Prātiśākhya of the Śukla Yajurveda,[139] must have lived in the second half of the 3rd century B.C.

The two Śrautasūtras of the Ṛgveda, that of Āśvalāyana and that of the Śāṅkhāyana school, present some interesting problems.

---

[130] KŚS. 5, 12, 1ff. (Mitravindā, CALAND, A. Z., no. 183); 15, 7, 30—34 (CALAND, A. Z., no. 178).

[131] See e.g. KŚS. 25, 4, 28: BŚS. 13, 43: 150, 17.

[132] Cf. e.g. CALAND, in ArchRel 11, p. 129; CALAND and HENRY, L'agniṣṭoma, p. 15; 37; 109; 292 etc.

[133] See GONDA, V. L., p. 352.

[134] Cf. RENOU, Écoles, p. 184.

[135] With the exception of Āśvalāyana.

[136] Cf. e.g. KŚS. 15, 8, 10—13; 1, 5: Jaiminī-Sūtra 5, 1.

[137] D. V. GARGE, Citations in Śābarabhāṣya, Poona 1952, p. 16; 52.

[138] The term *mīmāṃsā* is in the Vādhūla *anvākhyānas* used in the sense of "ritualistic consideration"; see e.g. also ĀpŚS. 15, 18, 12; 19, 16, 9.

[139] See H. SCHARFE, Grammatical literature, in this History, vol. V, p. 127ff. with the literature in n. 25 and 26.

The name of the Śāṅkhāyana-Śrautasūtra,[140] which does not occur in the text itself, is based on the colophons of the chapters *(adhyāya)*. The author was called Suyajña.[141] His work is closely related with the Kauṣītaki-Brāhmaṇa. A good many of its *sūtras* rest on passages of this text.[142] Even alternative injunctions ascribed in the Brāhmaṇa to *eke* are stated to be possible rites.[143] On the other hand, differences in details are not lacking[144] and in a fair number of cases a deviation from the own Brāhmaṇa means agreement with another, especially the Śatapatha and the Jaiminīya.[145] Some passages give rise to the question as to whether the author has really known the Brāhmaṇa. Why does he for instance mention the whole *nigada*—a *yajus* formula to be recited by the *adhvaryu* aloud and expressing an exhortation—which is also cited completely at KB. 28, 5f. (ŚŚS. 7, 6, 2)? Since KB. 26, 10 refers to the three stanzas quoted at 10, 9, 17—which make one hymn in AVŚ. 6, 35—only with the initial words the question cannot be evaded as to how far the author of the Brāhmaṇa was acquainted with the Sūtra.[146] Puzzled by these places Caland threw out the suggestion that the Kauṣītaki-Brāhmaṇa presupposed this Sūtra, which then might have existed prior to its Brāhmaṇa. Other hypotheses seem to be worth considering too: both works may have been completed simultaneously or—what is the most probable solution—the author of the Brāhmaṇa was in dealing with the rituals so well acquainted with an

---

[140] The Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, with the commentary of Varadattasuta Ānartīya, ed. by A. Hillebrandt, Calcutta (B. I.), I (Text, critical notes, indices), 1888; II and III (the commentary), 1891; 1897; followed by IV (The commentary of Govinda on ch. XVII and XVIII), 1899. Translation: W. Caland, Śāṅkhāyana-Śrautasūtra (posthumously) edited with an Introduction by Lokesh Chandra, Lahore 1953 (not the complete work, up to 17, 9 incl.; the Śunaḥśepa episode, 15, 17—27 has been left untranslated). The translation of chapter I has been published separately in ABORI 32, p. 174; likewise the Introduction: Lokesh Chandra, Studies in the ŚŚS., Nagpur 1953.

[141] See Ānartīya on ŚŚS. 1, 2, 18 and the places mentioned in ch. II, 2.

[142] E.g. ŚŚS. 2, 5, 12: KB. 1, 4; 3, 13, 25: KB. 5, 1; for more places: Lokesh Chandra, Introduction, p. XII.

[143] E.g. ŚŚS. 9, 23, 8 (cf. KB. 19, 2); 9, 24, 4 (cf. KB. 19, 4).

[144] E.g. ŚŚS. 3, 18, 8; 4, 7, 16; 6, 6, 21; 9, 4, 7.

[145] See e.g. ŚŚS. 2, 12, 10f. (ŚB. 1, 9, 3, 21; compare the whole chapters 2, 11—13); 3, 3, 1f. (ŚB. 11, 1, 5, 1ff.; KŚS. 25, 4, 46, Abhyuddṛṣṭeṣṭi); 3, 7, 1; 4 (ŚB. 11, 4, 3, 19; 6; 7, *mitravindā* sacrifice); 3, 18, 8 (ŚB. 2, 6, 3, 9; cf. KB. 5, 8); 4, 7, 16 (ŚB. 1, 7, 4, 21; cf. KB. 6, 12, *brahmatvam*); 8, 10 (cf. ŚB. 4, 4, 5, 4; 11); 8, 11, 5 (ŚB. 4, 4, 5, 23); 8, 12, 11 (ŚB. 3, 8, 5, 11); 15, 2, 12 (ŚB. 5, 1, 4, 12); 2, 5, 2 (TS. 2, 2, 5, 5f.); 2, 3, 10 (cf. ĀpŚS. 5, 21, 5); 2, 12, 10f. (cf. ĀpŚS. 6, 19, 2; ŚB. 1, 9, 3, 21); in some cases a *sūtra* may be based on KB. as well as on another *brāhmaṇa*; see e.g. Caland's note on ŚŚS. 8, 11, 12. For the Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa see Lokesh Chandra, Introduction, p. XIV and compare e.g. ŚŚS. 10, 21, 17: JB. 3, 307; 13, 5, 14: 1, 344; 13, 12, 10: 1, 351. ŚŚS. 13, 13, 1 is almost identical with PB. 9, 3, 1.

[146] Also because a grammatical irregularity in KB. 16, 8 can be explained as due to the author's acquaintance with ŚŚS. 8, 6, 11. For more particulars see Lokesh Chandra, Introduction, p. XIII and Caland's notes.

older (oral) redaction of the Sūtra text[147]—or rather with the wording and arrangement of ideas that were traditional—that he was at times under their influence.[148] On the other hand, the fact that the references in the present Sūtra to the Ṛgveda-Saṃhitā and the *khilas*[149] differ a few times from the traditional Śākala text[150]—it does not moreover recognize all eleven Vālakhilya hymns[151]—has led to the conclusion that it follows the Bāṣkala recension of the Ṛgveda, the concluding words of which are indeed quoted at ŚGS. 4, 5, 9.[152] Although the evidence derivable from several sources is contradictory[153] the same conclusion seems to obtain for Āśvalāyana. In any case both *sūtra* works recognize the same *saṃhitā*.[154]

Yet, according to the commentator Gārgya Nārāyaṇa (on 1, 1, 1) the Āśvalāyana-Śrautasūtra[155] follows not only the Bāṣkala but, quite intelligibly, also the practically identical Śākala recension,[156] "together with the *nivids*, *praiṣas*, *purorucas*, Kuntāpa hymns, Vālakhilyas, Mahānāmnī verses and the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa".[157] The relations maintained by this Sūtra with the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa—which constitutes the link between Sūtra and Saṃhitā—are much

---

[147] See also the relevant passage in chapter II, 2 above.

[148] ĀśvŚS. 12, 9 is verbally identical with AiB. 7, 1 "which seems to be derived from it" (KEITH, R. B., p. 52).

[149] See K. PARAMESWARA AITHAL, Ṛgvedic khilas and the sūtras of Āśvalāyana, in ALB 33 (1969), p. 182.

[150] ŚŚS. 10, 12, 5 (where ĀśvŚS. 8, 12, 5 has what we expect); 16, 3, 21; see CALAND's notes and LOKESH CHANDRA, Introduction, p. XVII. For ṚVKhila 4, 10 (cf. GONDA, V. L., p. 35) see ŚŚS. 15, 3, 8 with CALAND's note.

[151] See GONDA, V. L., p. 37.

[152] I.e. *khila* 5, 1, 5; 5, 3, 7 or ṚV. 10, 191, 5 (in the Śākala recension 10, 191 has only four stanzas). On this point see H. OLDENBERG, Die Hymnen des Rigveda, I. Metrische und textgeschichtliche Prolegomena, Berlin 1888, p. 514; 517; 528; I. SCHEFTELOWITZ, in ZDMG 74, p. 196; RENOU, Écoles, p. 24; GONDA, V. L., p. 45.

[153] I refer to RENOU, loc. cit. Cf. ĀśvGS. 3, 5, 9. The differences between the recensions, relating only to *khilas* and Vālakhilyas, are slight.

[154] And represent therefore so-called *caraṇas*; see GONDA, V. L., p. 29.

[155] The Śrauta Sūtra of Āśvalāyana with the commentary of Gārgya Nārāyaṇa ed. by RĀMANĀRĀYAṆA VIDYĀRATNA, Calcutta (B. I.) 1874; with the same commentary ed. by G. Ś. GOKHALE, Poona 1917; Āśvalāyana-Śrautasūtram with Siddhāntin Bhāṣya, ed. MAṄGALA DEVA ŚĀSTRĪ, Benares 1938 (only *adhyāya* I is known to me). A new edition (with five commentaries) is in course of preparation (Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Institute, Hoshiarpur). A partial German translation (which is to be continued) by K. MYLIUS, I, in ZMR 51 (1967), p. 246; 340; II in AO 34 (Copenhagen 1972), p. 96; III in MIO 17 (1971—72), p. 63. Chapter V was moreover translated by P. SABBATHIER, Études de liturgie védique. L'agniṣṭoma d'après le Śrautasūtra d'Āśvalāyana, in JA 8, 15 (1890), p. 1; 186 (with notes).

[156] See also Nārāyaṇa on ĀśvGS. 3, 5, 9 and R. G. BHANDARKAR, The relation between the sūtras of Āśvalāyana and Śāṅkhāyana . . ., in 9 Int. Congr. Or. I, p. 411, according to whom (A. D. 1892) brahmins of the Āśvalāyana school describe themselves as *ṛgvedāntargatāśvalāyanaśākalaśākhādhyāyin*.

[157] For these terms see GONDA, V. L., Index, s. s. v. v.

looser than those between Śāṅkhāyana and the Kauṣītaki-Brāhmaṇa.[158] The school of the Aitareyins is cited as a separate and somewhat distant authority,[159] possibly a reminiscence of the *sūtra*'s origin as a text of the no longer existing Āśvalāyana recension.[160] Other facts are not inconsistent with the above. Āśvalāyana often mentions names of authorities which do not occur in the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa.[161] Whereas Śāṅkhāyana does not always coincide with the Kauṣītaki, Āśvalāyana is sometimes more in conformity with the latter than with the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa from which it often differs. Moreover, Āśvalāyana is more comprehensive and deals also with rites that are not treated in the Aitareya.[162]

As to the order in which the contents of these works[163] are presented there are in both cases, and especially in that of Śāṅkhāyana, striking differences between these ritual works and the *brāhmaṇas*. There are also many details in which these manuals diverge.[164] In both of them the most essential feature is the strict division between the non-*soma* sacrifices which are placed in the initial chapters on one hand and the *soma* ceremonies on the other, and—especially in Śāṅkhāyana—a fresh arrangement of the material falling under these headings. Thus ŚŚS. I deals with the sacrifices of full and new moon (KB. III) which are the model of the *iṣṭis*; II with *agnyādheya*, *punarādheya* (KB. I), *agnihotra* and *agnyupasthāna* (KB. II), III with the special offerings (KB. IV), the four-monthly sacrifices (KB. V), and the *prāyaścittas* (KB. 26, 3–6); IV with some minor points (*piṇḍapitṛyajña*,[165] *śūlagava* etc.) which are not represented in the Brāhmaṇa. The corresponding part of Āśvalāyana's manual I–III, dealing with the full and new moon sacrifices etc. as well as the animal sacrifice, contains much more than the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa, which treats of the *agnihotra* in 5, 26–31, the animal sacrifice (ĀśvŚS. 3, 1–8) in 2, 1–14 and the *prāyaścittas* in 7, 2–12, but has no parallel passages for the other rites (*inter alia* the *sautrāmaṇi*: 3, 9). ĀśvŚS. II is a long chapter which incorporates all *haviryajñas* other than the *darśapūrṇamāsau* including the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*, the

---

[158] See G. Choudhuri, in 19 AIOC, S. P., Delhi 1957, p. 9; (especially in ĀśvŚS. I–III) Mylius, in ZMR 51, p. 247; 255.

[159] Cf. ĀśvŚS. 1, 3, 12; 3, 6, 3; 10, 1, 13.

[160] Cf. Gonda, V. L., p. 16.

[161] Āśmarathya (5, 13, 10; 6, 10, 30); Kautsa (1, 2, 5; 1, 4, 6; 7, 1, 19; his name does occur in ŚB., PB. etc.); Gāṇagāri (2, 6, 16; 3, 6, 6; 3, 11, 18 etc.); Taulvali (2, 6, 17; 5, 6, 24) and Śaṭyāyanakam (1, 4, 13; cf. Gonda, V. L., p. 349).

[162] See below and also Mylius, in ZMR 51, p. 247. For ritual details that are not recorded elsewhere see e.g. ŚŚS. 2, 4, 6; 4, 12, 10; 8, 10, 1.

[163] For detailed surveys see Keith, R. B., p. 50; for ŚŚS.: Lokesh Chandra, Introduction, p. XIX; Kashikar, S. Ś., p. 87; for ĀśvŚS.: Mylius, in ZMR 51, p. 246ff.; Kashikar, p. 82.

[164] See e.g. Caland and Henry, L'agniṣṭoma, p. 85; 145; 190f.; 216; 269 etc.; Dumont, L'agnihotra, p. 159ff.; 183ff.; Renou, Écoles, p. 41. Compare also the *brahmatvam* as set forth in ĀśvŚS. 1, 12 with ŚŚS. 3, 21; 8, 15.

[165] O. Donner, Piṇḍapitṛyajña, Berlin 1870.

minor mostly non-periodical rites and the important *hautram* of these rites.[166] The *agniṣṭoma* (KB. VII–XVI; 18, 6–14) follows in ŚŚS. V–VIII and ĀśvŚS. IV and V (AiB. 1, 1–3, 48); the *ukthya, ṣoḍaśin, atirātra* etc. (KB. 16, 11–17, 9; 18, 1–5; 19, 1–7) in ŚŚS. IX and ĀśvŚS. 6, 1–6 (AiB. 3, 49–50; 4, 1–11); the concluding rites of the *agniṣṭoma* which in ŚŚS. are placed before the *ukthya* are dealt with in ĀśvŚS. 6, 11–14 (AiB. 3, 47–48). Being much better arranged than the Āśvalāyana, the Śāṅkhāyana has brought together in chapter X all elements of the *dvādaśāha* (in KB. XXII, XXIII, 26, 7–17 and XXVII); XI contains some other *soma* rites (in KB. XIX, XX, XXIV, XXV); XII the *śastras* (recitations) of the *hotrakas* (the assistants of the *hotar*, in KB. XXV, XXVIII–XXX); XIII certain *prāyaścittas, sattras, gavām ayana* etc. (in KB. XVIII, XIX, XXVI). Much of this material recurs in ĀśvŚS. VII and VIII which, notwithstanding differences in the order, corresponds with AiB. 4, 12–5, 25. To the books IX–XII, dealing with the *ahīnas* and *sattras*, of Āśvalāyana there is hardly anything in the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa to correspond. ŚSS. XIV–XVI constitute a separate section, partly a *brāhmaṇa* in style and dealing with one day sacrifices, *vājapeya, rājasūya, aśvamedha, puruṣamedha* (human sacrifice), the *brahmatva* and those sacrifices which increase by one day (at best passingly mentioned in the Brāhmaṇa). The books XVII and XVIII are an addendum. Dealing with the *mahāvrata* ceremony they are really supplements to the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, chapters I and II, which represent the *brāhmaṇa* text that belongs to them.[167] Since these four chapters are in style and language practically similar and there are no indications of priority on either side, they may have been composed contemporaneously in the same school.

The problem of the chronological relations between both *sūtras*[168] is disputed and for the time being probably unsolvable. Āśvalāyana's work has been regarded as somewhat older because it is less systematically arranged[169] and because the Śāṅkhāyana-Āraṇyaka impresses the reader as younger than the Aitareya-Āraṇyaka.[170] The opposite opinion was defended on the strength of a general impression of antiquity on Śāṅkhāyana's side,[171] the absence of any 'discussion' in the succinct style of Āśvalāyana and the incorporation of *brāhmaṇa*like passages in the other work.[172] This peculiarity is however limited to the chapters XIV–XVI, where we indeed find motivations, explanations,

---

[166] HILLEBRANDT, Ritualliteratur, p. 115.

[167] I refer to GONDA, V. L., p. 427. See also WEBER, I. L., ²p. 54; KEITH, in JRAS 1907, I, p. 410 and see Govinda's introductory note on chapter XVII.

[168] See also ch. I, section 2.

[169] KEITH, in JRAS 1907, p. 412.

[170] For this problem see A. B. KEITH, The Aitareya-Āraṇyaka, Oxford 1909 (1969), p. 26; 70; followed by GOPAL, I. V. K., p. 71; see also GONDA, V. L., p. 428.

[171] WEBER, I. L., ²p. 59.

[172] HILLEBRANDT, Edition of ŚŚS., I, p. X, whose reference to the human sacrifice in ŚŚS. 16, 10–14 can no longer be considered a valid argument (see above, ch. I, 2, n. 64). See also KASHIKAR, S. Ś., p. 88; MYLIUS, in ZMR 51, p. 248.

references to mythical events[173] and—in the one day sacrifices of chapter XIV—many repetitions as well as the Śunaḥśepa episode (15, 17–27); this corresponds to Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa 7, 13–18,[174] and follows the description of the *rājasūya*. Anyhow, the different portions of Śāṅkhāyana's Sūtra, which creates the impression of a conglomeration, can hardly be regarded as wholly contemporaneous; the *mahāvrata* section (XVIIf.) is probably older than the other parts.[175] From parts to argue to the whole is impossible.

Since both *śrautasūtras* comprise also sections on the *agnihotra* and the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* in which the *hotar* does not function[176] the question may arise as to whether these *sūtras* should be exclusively characterized as manuals for that officiant.[177] However, the duties of this functionary claim most of the compiler's attention. There are even technical passages on the recitation of the Veda, including also *sūtras* on *sandhi* phenomena (ĀśvŚS. 1, 5); on distinctions such as formulas pronounced audibly and those pronounced in a low voice; on monotonous or other recitation; on skilful compositions employed in reciting.[178] So the term 'manual of recitation' is not unsuitable. In *mantras* Śāṅkhāyana is much richer than Āśvalāyana. Among these are twelve which, though quoted *pratīkena*, are not found in the Śākala recension of the Ṛgveda.[179] A curious feature is the mainly laudatory versified portion ŚŚS. 12, 14–24 occurring between references to other hymns and eulogistic verses.

Turning now to the Sāmaveda I must—after the general remark that the so-called *śrautasūtras* of this Veda are generally speaking treatises on *śrauta* subjects viewed from sāmavedic points of view rather than complete *śrauta* manuals—first invite attention to the Ārṣeyakalpa.[180] Because it was composed

[173] Such as occur in BŚS.; cf. ŚŚS. 15, 1, 4; 15, 12, 15; 15, 13, 4. For *brāhmaṇa* style and myths see e.g. 15, 1, 10 ff.; 15, 4, 4; 15, 5, 1; 15, 6, 6f.; 15, 12, 1; 5; 15f.

[174] I refer to GONDA, V. L., p. 394; for variant readings etc. see KEITH, R. B., p. 299.

[175] Cf. also HILLEBRANDT, op. cit., I, p. XII; LOKESH CHANDRA, Introduction, p. XII. For ĀśvŚS. 2, 12, the *pavitreṣṭi*, which according to Gārgya was interpolated, see also K. AITHAL, Āśvalāyana-Gṛhya-Pariśiṣṭa, Adyar, Madras 1964, p. 8 (it was known to Sāyaṇa).

[176] The remarks on the *rājasūya* in which the *hotar* has not much to do are brief (ŚŚS. 15, 12ff.; Āśv. 9, 3f.).

[177] CALAND, in GGA 1897, p. 281. For an act enjoined upon the sacrificer and occurring only here see ŚŚS. 2, 7, 13f.

[178] For details see KASHIKAR, S. Ś., p. 84 etc. Cf. e.g. ĀśvŚS. 1, 1, 20f.; 1, 2, 8; 1, 2, 9; 7, 11, 1–6; 9–21 etc. (with Gārgya's commentary).

[179] See HILLEBRANDT, Edition of ŚŚS. I, p. 628; and in Bezzenberger's Beiträge 8, p. 195; OLDENBERG, op. cit., p. 361; RENOU, Écoles, p. 28.

[180] Edition: Der Ārṣeyakalpa des Sāmaveda herausgegeben und bearbeitet von W. CALAND, Leipzig 1908 (with an introduction, identification of the *sāmans* etc.). See also A. WEBER, I. S. I, p. 42; W. CALAND, De wording van den Sāmaveda, Amsterdam Acad. 1907, p. 8; and in ZDMG 64, p. 347; KASHIKAR, S. Ś., p. 89. The Taṇḍālakaṣaṇasūtra (PARPOLA, Ś. L. D., p. 66) is a systematic condensation of the Ārṣeyakalpa which includes also the Kṣudrasūtra and a Vārttika on it. Often the title of a sāmavedic text does not tally with its contents. For a bibliography: PARPOLA, Ś. L. D., I, 1, p. 11.

by Maśaka—probably the descendant of Garga mentioned at LŚS. 7, 9, 14[181]—it is also known as Maśaka-Kalpasūtra, in colophons briefly as Kalpasūtra.[182] It describes in eleven chapters (*prapāṭhaka* or *adhyāya*)[183] the *gavām ayana*, the *ekāhas*, the *ahīnas* and the *sattras*. It follows the Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa[184] and—as far as necessary—the Ṣaḍviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa—closely. The work, which at first sight is nothing more than a very dry list of all the *sāmans* to be applied and the *stomas* prescribed, gives the so-called *klpti* of the *stomas*, that is, the forms in which the 'hymns of praise' *(stotra)* are chanted.[185] In setting forth the composition of the various chants the author mentions the *mantras* from the Sāmaveda *pratīkena* and, true to the *sūtra* style, avoids repetition. Where the prescriptions of the Pañcaviṃśa failed him he could use his own discretion, probably noticing also Jaiminīya usage. When a *sāman* has already been mentioned in connexion with some sacrifice, he only refers—to the embarrassment of a modern reader—to that sacrifice. Unfortunately, Varadarāja's commentary which is a great help is incomplete (not available for the last two chapters). The Ārṣeyakalpa must be older than the Sūtras of Lāṭyāyana and Drāhyāyaṇa;[186] it is highly probable that it was even known to the authorities cited by these *sūtrakāras*.[187] It is also older than the Ūha- and Ūhyagānas,[188] because in ritual practice these works follow the later Puṣpasūtra. Another indicium of its early origin is the presentation of the facts relating to the no doubt ancient *abhicaraṇīyas*, *soma* sacrifices lasting one day and aiming at incantation: these are dealt with together in ṢB. 3, 2—11, but in Maśaka's work treated dispersedly and in most cases where they occur in the Yajurveda.[189] Internal evidence helping to determine the time in which the work was composed is almost wanting. The ritual presupposed by the Ārṣeyakalpa is not in all respects identical with that of the Kauthuma- or Rāṇāyanīya-Saṃhitās,[190] but for a correct understanding of the sūtras of Lāṭyāyana and Drāhyāyaṇa as well as the Sāmaveda in general and the development of the sāmavedic literature it is indispensable.

[181] Cf. also WEBER, I. S. IV, p. 373; 384.

[182] WEBER, I. L., p. 82f.

[183] Cf. PARPOLA, S. L. D. I, 1, p. 53.

[184] The chants of the ceremonies of twelve days *(dvādaśāha)* are however omitted because they are dealt with in detail in the Brāhmaṇa. See also CALAND, Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa, Calcutta 1931, p. XXIII.

[185] More precisely, a *stotra* "laud" is the chant of a certain number of stanzas *(ṛcas)* set to one of the numerous melodies; a *stoma* indicates the number of the verses chanted either during a whole day of a *soma* festival or during part of it.

[186] Cf. LŚS. 9, 5, 22; 10, 10, 20; CALAND, Edition, p. XII. It must have existed before the Kauthumas and Rāṇāyanīyas (GONDA, V. L., p. 318) separated.

[187] According to A. PARPOLA, in Vol. Raghu Vira, p. 71 this is not absolutely certain.

[188] CALAND, in ZDMG 64, p. 347; cf. GONDA, V. L., p. 317f.

[189] CALAND, Edition, p. XI.

[190] Vāradarāja was a Rāṇāyanīya. Generally speaking, the relations between the schools and texts of the Sāmaveda are very complicated and sometimes almost inextricable.

The Kṣudrasūtra,[191] though clearly a supplement to the Ārṣeyakalpa, has long since been regarded as a part of it. It deals, in three chapters,[192] with *soma* rites of one day performed as atonement *(prāyaścitta)* or for the fulfilment of a special wish *(kāmya)*. Since it is, in style and arrangement, widely different from the Ārṣeyakalpa—especially in the last chapter there are *brāhmaṇa*like passages and digressions—Maśaka's authorship, assumed by tradition,[193] is uncertain. The text is probably anterior to Lāṭyāyana.

At this point attention must be drawn to the complexity of the sāmavedic literature and to the existence of a number of Kauthuma *sūtra* texts for *śrauta* purposes that, generally speaking, have been long neglected and in any case have not yet been adequately studied. An explanatory work on the *gṛhya* ritual as described by Gobhila,[194] whilst enumerating the sāmavedic texts, makes mention of the "ten *sūtras*": Kalpa (i.e. Ārṣeya), Kṣudra, Lāṭyāyana (in fact, the only Śrautasūtra proper), Upagrantha, Pañcavidha, Nidāna, Tāṇḍyalakṣaṇa, Anupada, Anustotra and Kalpānupada. The greater part of these works attach themselves to the Ārṣeyakalpa. These connexions with other works and, in all probability,[195] the variability of the *sāmans* in the different schools—the only invariable element being the *ṛcas*—should be taken into account in attempts at explaining the divergences from the basic texts.

The Nidānasūtra[196] describes, from the sāmavedic point of view, the ceremonies and indicates the metres of the *mantras* that are to be sung and the melodies to which they are set. The term *nidāna* denoting the connexions between religious realities and ritual acts based on the principle of identity,[197] the author purposes to elucidate the relations between rites and *sāmans* or metres. The initial sections of the treatise are indeed one of the best descriptions of Vedic metres transmitted to posterity.[198] After some generalities and a description of the ritual prototypes the author rather eclectically deals with the various *soma* sacrifices. Occasionally he treats also questions of *prātiśākhya*

---

[191] Edited by CALAND, Ārṣeyakalpa, p. 171ff. (see above, n. 180).

[192] Prapāṭhaka, elsewhere in six *adhyāyas* (PARPOLA, Ś. L. D., I, 1, p. 53).

[193] Cf. CALAND, Ārṣeyakalpa, p. VII (Agnisvāmin on LŚS. 6, 1, 7 quoting KṣS. 3, 1).

[194] Gobhilīya-Gṛhyakarma-Prakāśikā, p. 128. Instead of Tāṇḍyalakṣaṇa one should read Taṇḍā — (see. n. 180).

[195] Cf. CALAND, Ārṣeyakalpa, p. VIII; X. For the Anuṣṭotrasūtra see PARPOLA, Ś. L. D., I, 1, p. 66.

[196] Edited by SATYAVRATA SĀMAŚRAMĪ, in Uṣā 3 (Calcutta 1896; unsatisfactory); K. N. BHATNAGAR, Nidāna-Sūtra of Patañjali edited ... together with an introduction, a fragmentary commentary and indices, Lahore 1939 (²Delhi n.d.; summary: p. 48—66; a fairly good edition). See also WEBER, I. S. I, p. 44; and I. L., p. 89; RENOU, in JA 231 (1939), p. 151; S. VARMA, in 6 AIOC, p. 551; GONDA, V. L., p. 321.

[197] Cf. L. RENOU, Connexion en védique ..., Vol. K. C. Kunhan Raja, Adyar, Madras 1946, p. 55; and in JA 241, p. 171; H. OLDENBERG, Vorwissenschaftliche Wissenschaft, Göttingen 1919, p. 117; GONDA, R. I. I, p. 176.

[198] Edited and translated separately by WEBER, I. S. VIII (1863), p. 83.

such as *saṃdhi* (3, 5). Hence the hybrid style of the difficult text[199] which is allied to *kalpa* as well as *prātiśākhya* literature. The manual—which may in a sense be regarded as a redaction of the Ārṣeyakalpa and of those portions of the Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa[200] which are considered in that work—gives much information on rituals and also valuable details of literary interest, borrowed from various sources and for the greater part unknown from other treatises. There are numerous references to *brāhmaṇas* and some *mantras* that are not found elsewhere. The author, who evinces a certain aversion to the Kauṣītakins, was acquainted with the above works, but—as far as appears from the text—not with Lāṭyāyana and Drāhyāyaṇa, although some passages run parallel with their manuals.[201] He may have written independently of these authorities. In any case his language and his numerous references to the other sāmavedic literature do not prove him an early writer.[202] Caland[203] adduced some arguments (quotations and references) to make the traditional assumption that he was identical with the grammarian Patañjali acceptable, but the author's mode of expression hardly warrants this supposition. Moreover, Indians were already at an early date inclined to attribute difficult works to great authorities. A quotation from the Brāhmaṇa (3, 12) which is not in the Pañcaviṃśa and other differences led Caland[204] to call the author's allegiance to the Kauthuma *śākhā* —thus the tradition— or to the Rāṇāyanīyas in question and to suggest that he belonged to the Bhāllaviśākhā.

There exists also an Upanidānasūtra which, after beginning with the same words as the Nidānasūtra, deals, as an *anukramaṇī* or index, with the different metres, first in a general way, and then especially in connexion with the two Ārcikas of the Sāmaveda.[205]

The Upagranthasūtra,[206] attributed to Kātyāyana,[207] is in its initial chapters a sort of appendix to or commentary on the Kṣudrasūtra—here referred to as Ārṣeyakalpa—and the relevant parts of the Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa. Its last portion contains a separate treatise on the *pratihāra*, that is that part of a *sāman* which is to be executed[208] by the *pratihartar*,

---

[199] There exists a commentary by Hṛṣīkeśa or Peṭṭaśāstrī only for chapter 1, 1—7 (Chandoviciti).

[200] CALAND, Ārṣeyakalpa, p. XIX.

[201] CALAND, Ārṣeyakalpa, p. XVIII; Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa, p. VI.

[202] Cf. also RENOU, in JA 231, p. 153.

[203] CALAND, Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa, p. V; see also the same, Die Jaiminīya-Saṃhitā, Breslau 1907, p. 17; 127 (p. 12 on the *sūtras* etc. of the Sāmaveda); cf. RENOU, Écoles, p. 115.

[204] CALAND, Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa, p. VI.

[205] Published in a South Indian *grantha* edition, see CALAND, Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa, p. VI.

[206] Edited by SATYAVRATA SĀMAŚRAMĪ, in Uṣā 4, Calcutta 1897. See also CALAND, Ārṣeyakalpa, p. XIX; PARPOLA, Ś. L. D., p. 53.

[207] Cf. the commentary on PB. 7, 4, 8 (CALAND, Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa, p. V and 142).

[208] Insert these words in GONDA, V. L., p. 432, l. 4.

one of the assistants of the *udgātar*. It is not one of the latest productions of the Sāmavedins.

The Śrautasūtra of Lāṭyāyana,[209] belonging to the Kauthuma recension of the Sāmaveda, deals with the duties of the *udgātar* and his assistants as well as the *brahmatvam* in *soma* rites and the seasonal sacrifices. The sections 4, 9–5, 4 excepted it deals exclusively with *soma* sacrifices, the only ones at which the chanters are needed. It consists of ten chapters *(prapāṭhaka)*[210] of which I and II treat of the *agniṣṭoma*, III and IV as well as 9, 5–12 of the *ahīnas*, V of the *brahmatvam*, VIII and 9, 1–4 of the *ekāhas*, X of the *sattras* and VI and VII of the so-called *sāmakḷpti*, i.e. the rules about the *sāmans* and coherent and technical expositions on the forms of the Vedic chants required in ritual practice.[211] Thus there is a section (VI, 2) on the use of the *viṣṭutis*–the different modes of forming, out of a triplet, the number of verses required for a laud–recorded in Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa II and III; an explanation of Maśaka's way of quoting the Uttarārcika (VI, 3);[212] rules governing the arrangement of the lauds (metres, deities etc.; 6, 9) and so on. Since texts dealing with the execution of the chants in ritual practice–which could differ according to school or region–are rare these chapters are of special interest. One passage may be quoted; 6, 10, 18–21:

"Pronouncing without slurring, not indistinctly, not tardily, without sputtering, with a chest-voice, without knocking the teeth together, without loud sounds–(thus) one should chant, according to Dhānaṃjayya. One should execute the *udgītha*[213] in such a way that the *ārcika* and non-*ārcika* texts, the *vṛddhi* and non-*vṛddhi*, *anudātta* and *udātta*, *karṣaṇa* and non-*karṣaṇa* are distinct and in accord with one another. The whole of it should be executed rather lightly; without dropping a (single) metrical unit".

Although Lāṭyāyana is an adherent of the Kauthuma recension[214] (Gujarat) and follows the Pañcaviṃśa[215] from which he quotes many passages, it is mainly the general arrangement and structure of the sacrificial ceremonies in which he

[209] Edition: Śrauta sūtra of Lāṭyāyana with the commentary of Agnisvāmī, edited by ĀNANDACHANDRA VEDĀNTAVĀGĪŚA, Calcutta (B. I.), 1872 (uncritical); A. PARPOLA, The Śrauta-sūtras of Lāṭyāyana and Drāhyāyaṇa and their commentaries. An English translation and study, I, 1 General Introduction, Helsinki 1968; I, 2, The agniṣṭoma, Helsinki 1969. See also Lāṭyāyana-Śrautasūtram, agniṣṭomāntam, Benares n.d.

[210] For a more detailed survey of the contents see PARPOLA, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 26.

[211] See R. SIMON, Lāṭyāyana VI, 10–VII, 13 übersetzt und erklärt, in ZII 2 (1923), p. 1.

[212] See GONDA, V. L., p. 314f.

[213] The chant (second part of a *sāman*) to be sung by the *udgātar*. For *ārcika* (collection of *ṛc* stanzas) see GONDA, V. L., p. 313ff. The other technical terms refer to vowel changes (Ablaut), (musical) accentuation (depending mainly on pitch) and lengthening of syllables in singing.

[214] For a probable Jaiminīya prescription in LŚS. 1, 10, 4; DŚS. 3, 2, 6 see CALAND on PB. 1, 2, 5.

[215] And, in places, the Ṣaḍviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa; see H. F. EELSINGH, Ṣaḍviṃśa-brāhmaṇam, Thesis Utrecht 1908, p. XXVIII; PARPOLA, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 88.

conforms to this basic text. In the chapters VIII–X he even dwells on sacrifices (*rājasūya, aśvamedha*, etc.) which are not or only passingly dealt with in the Brāhmaṇa. In this his work is markedly different from those yajurvedic *śrauta* manuals which run constantly parallel with their basic texts. Lāṭyāyana is not sparing of references to the views of other teachers such as Śāṇḍilya, Dhānaṃjayya, Gautama.[216] The names of these authorities differ with the exception of Gautama and Śāṇḍilya from those that occur in the *brāhmaṇas* of the Sāmaveda, but almost all of them are found in the Nidānasūtra.[217] The less frequent names occur mostly either assembled together in one passage or when a considerable number of views are mentioned. Like the Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa (17, 1–4) this work deals also (in 8, 6) with the *vrātyastomas, soma* rites lasting one day for the benefit of the errant groups of unorthodox Aryans, called *vrātyas*.[218]

Without rejecting Lāṭyāyana's Sūtra the Rāṇayaṇīyas, a southern school,[219] came to use the Drāhyāyaṇa-Śrautasūtra.[220] This is a slightly altered and probably much later redaction—comprising thirty-two chapters *(paṭala)*[221]—of the former manual, the difference lying mainly in some minor changes in the sequence of the matter treated of—which is not only nearly the same in both works but even expressed in the same words—and, in Drāhyāyaṇa's book, in some paraphrases and numerous additions, mostly of the nature of glosses or marginal notes that can easily be omitted without affecting the context.[222] The identical parts of both works must have belonged to one and the same *sūtra*. Although it seems that the original *sūtrakāra* was better informed, Drāhyāyaṇa creates the impression of correcting inconsistencies or introducing minor

---

[216] For details see PARPOLA, in Vol. Raghu Vira, p. 69, and the same, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 89. Cf. e.g. LŚS. 1, 1, 25; 1, 4, 13; 15; 5, 8, 7; 8; 5, 9, 9; 10; 12; 5, 10, 11; 5, 12, 10; 6, 1, 16. Dhānaṃjayya is mentioned 139 times, Śāṇḍilya 109 times, Gautama 78 times.

[217] Cf. also WEBER, I. S. I, p. 45f.; see p. 536 above and GONDA, V. L., p. 321.

[218] Cf. WEBER, I. L., p. 85, and especially J. W. HAUER, Der Vrātya, Stuttgart 1927; S. N. BISWAS, Über das Vrātya-problem in der vedischen Ritualliteratur, in ZDMG 105, p. *53; the same, Vrātyastoma, Thesis Berlin (Freie Univ.) 1955; J. C. HEESTERMAN, Vrātya and sacrifice, in IIJ 6 (1962), p. 1.

[219] See PARPOLA, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 40; 43 etc.

[220] Edition of chapters I–XI, 4 (in the copy in the possession of the Utrecht Univ. Library, formerly of Caland, I–XVI): J. N. REUTER, The Śrautasūtra of Drāhyāyaṇa with the commentary of Dhanvin, I, London 1904 (never completed; see PARPOLA, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 22; cf. also CALAND, in GGA 1907, p. 241); chapters XI–XV by RAGHU VIRA, in JVS 1 (1934). For PARPOLA's translation of I–VI see n. 209 above. For the title Pradhānasūtra see PARPOLA, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 32.

[221] Contents: I–VII *jyotiṣṭoma*, VIII–XI *gavām ayana*, XII–XV *brahmatvam*; XVI–XXI *ahīnas*; XXII–XXVI *ekāhas*; XXVII *aśvamedha*; XXVIII–XXXII *sattras*.

[222] However, the number of these 'additions' will appear to be less as soon as Lāṭyāyana's work is critically edited; not a few *sūtras* occurring in DŚS. are found in the commentary on LŚS.; see CALAND, in GGA 1907, p. 244. (Cf. also CALAND, in WZKM 18, p. 197 n. 1). For a study of these differences see PARPOLA, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 33.

modifications preferred in his rival school. The above facts mean that in these two manuals we possess another instructive illustration[223] of the development of the ritualistic schools, the same text being preserved both in an older and original, certainly not much interpolated form (LŚS.)[224] and in a later somewhat revised and amplified redaction.[225] A closer study of the nature and purpose of the differences may therefore contribute to the solution of the problems of the origin, development and nature of Vedic schools.

Though mentioning the views of the old exegetes (Gautama, Dhānaṃjayya, Śāṇḍilya and others) and quoting and commenting upon the Lāṭyāyana-Śrautasūtra, the Kalpānupadasūtra[226] is a rather late compilation. It has adopted a long passage from the Nidānasūtra and some portions from the Anupadasūtra. It is badly preserved and difficult of understanding.

In accordance with its name, the probably rather late Anupadasūtra[227] follows in the main the Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa "word for word": 1, 1–9 corresponds with PB. I; for 1, 10 dealing with the lustral bath see ṢB. 3, 1; 1, 11–7, 2 treat of the *soma* sacrifices as dealt with in PB. VI–XXV; 7, 3–11 of the *gavām ayana* after PB. IV and V. The rest of the ten chapters deals with various subjects, for the greater part not treated in the two Brāhmaṇas. Among these are the solo *sāmans* to be sung at the *pravargya* and the *agnicayana* (7, 12) and the *subrahmaṇyā* litany and its variations (8, 1–3). The quotations from *brāhmaṇas* occurring in the text are of special importance for the history of that branch of literature; they are very instructive with regard to the lost *brāhmaṇas*.[228] Although the Anupadasūtra must be posterior to Lāṭyāyana it has, it seems deliberately, taken no notice of his Śrauta manual. This is in harmony with the fact that it hardly quotes from works other than *brāhmaṇas*: it is[229] a collection of rules that accepts only *brāhmaṇas* as authorities *(anubrāhmaṇiko vidhiḥ)*. This work moreover seems to be a connecting link between the *śrautasūtras*—which, while belonging to Vedic schools, are loose in their definitions and very sparing in their motivations or reasons why a definite practice has been adopted and another not—and the Mīmāṃsāsūtra, which, without attaching itself to a particular branch or school of the Veda, defines exactly,

[223] Compare e.g. the relation between the Kāṭhaka- and the Kapiṣṭhala-Saṃhitā, etc. (PARPOLA, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 34).

[224] PARPOLA, in Vol. Raghu Vira, p. 69. See also KNAUER, Das Gobhilagṛhyasūtra, II, Dorpat 1886, p. 40; RENOU, Écoles, p. 103f.

[225] For different interpretations of one and the same *sūtra* by the two commentators (Agnisvāmin and Daṇḍin) see KASHIKAR, S. Ś., p. 131.

[226] Not edited. See CALAND, Ārṣeyakalpa, p. XX; Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa, p. V and especially PARPOLA, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 65.

[227] Not yet edited. See WEBER, I. S. I, p. 43; I. L., ²p. 88; CALAND, Ārṣeyakalpa, p. XX; Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa, p. V; EELSINGH, op. cit., p. XXVIII and especially PARPOLA, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 58 (from whom most of the following factual information has been quoted). Was the author Suśārada Śālaṅkāyana? (cf. CALAND, in AO 1, p. 8; PARPOLA, op. cit., p. 60).

[228] For a survey see PARPOLA, op. cit., p. 61.

[229] According to Agnisvāmin, in the Introduction to his Commentary on LŚS.

enters into controversies, treats every question exhaustively and discusses details on the basis of the entire Vedic tradition:[230] this may corroborate the suggestion that the Pūrvamīmāṃsā must have originated in sāmavedic circles.[231]

The Pañcavidhasūtra[232] is a comparatively ancient treatise dealing with the execution of *sāmans* in ritual practice. It differs in many respects from the relevant part of Lāṭyāyana's work to which it is posterior. It describes how a *sāman* must be divided into its "five component parts", the *prastāva* (prelude to be sung by the *prastotar*); the *udgītha* (the most important element to be sung by the *udgātar*); the *pratihāra* (executed by the *pratihartar*); the *upadrava* (sung by the *udgātar*); and the *nidhana* (the concluding passage sung in chorus). Since the exact extent of the *prastāva*, *pratihāra* and *nidhana* is, in the Indian theory, set forth in detail, the *udgītha* and *upadrava* are, also in this work, to be known deductively. The manual deals *inter alia* with the definitions or delimitations of the constituent parts of the various chant-strophes, general rules for the *prastāva*, *pratihāra*, and *nidhana*, rules about *stobhas* (modifications of a *ṛc*, especially insertions), and so on. There exist also separate treatises devoted to each of the three subjects, viz. a Prastāvasūtra[233] which is handed down as the concluding part of the Puṣpasūtra or Phullasūtra;[234] a Pratihārasūtra, likewise ascribed to Kātyāyana; and a Nidhanasūtra.

The Sāmatantra, written in concise *sūtra* style, is a supplement to the Puṣpasūtra.[235]

The Mātrālakṣaṇasūtra[236] deals with the *mātrās* (one *mātrā* is the time required to pronounce a short vowel) of the sounds.

The Stobhānusaṃhāra is a small treatise (43 *ślokas*) laying down the rules relating to the application of *stobhas*.[237]

---

[230] Cf. D. V. GARGE, Citations in Śābara-Bhāṣya, Poona 1952, p. 50; PARPOLA, op. cit., p. 59.

[231] L. RENOU(-J. FILLIOZAT), I. C. II, p. 8.

[232] Edited and translated by R. SIMON, Pañcavidhasūtra, Breslau 1913; B. R. SHARMA, Pañcavidhasūtra and Mātrālakṣaṇa (a treatise on the prosodical or syllabic instants consisting of forty-two *sūtras*), Tirupati 1970. Compare also HILLEBRANDT, Ritualliteratur, p. 100; CALAND and HENRY, L'agniṣṭoma, p. 178; J. M. VAN DER HOOGT, The Vedic chant, Thesis Amsterdam 1929, p. 58 (for a bibliography of the Sāmaveda see p. 75); PARPOLA, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 54; 65.

[233] Cf. SIMON, Pañcavidhasūtra, Introduction, p. 6.

[234] Mention of this work has already been made in GONDA, V. L., p. 321. See also SV. PRAJÑĀNĀNANDA, Music material in the Puṣpasūtra, in Nāda Rūpa 2 (1963), 2, p. 34 and WEBER, I. S. I, p. 46; I. L., [2]p. 90; CALAND, in ZDMG 64, p. 348; PARPOLA, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 54. For the Pratihārasūtra WEBER, I. L., [2]p. 92.

[235] Published in KṚṢṆASVĀMIN ŚRAUTIN, Sāmavedasaṃhitāyāṃ Kauthumaśākhāyā Veyagānam, Tiruvadi 1889 (*grantha* characters). See A. C. BURNELL, Ārṣeyabrāhmaṇa, Mangalore 1876, p. XXIV; WEBER, I. S. I, p. 48; CALAND, Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa, p. VII. For the Ṛktantra see GONDA, V. L., p. 321.

[236] Published ibidem.

[237] See A. C. BURNELL, Saṃhītopaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa, Mangalore 1877, p. XVI; CALAND, Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa, p. VII. The work has been published in a collection of sāmavedic treatises mentioned above in n. 205. Compare also the

The Gāyatra-Vidhānasūtra,[238] composed by Śuṅga, lays down the rules according to which the *gāyatra* chant is to be applied at the *bahiṣpavamāna-stotra* (the "out-of-door laud" to be repeated outside the hut or shed on the sacrificial place called *sadas*), and other *stotras*.

The Jaiminīya-Śrautasūtra[239] belongs to the Jaiminīya recension of the Sāmaveda. The published text, based on two manuscripts, comprises in twenty-six sections mainly a description of the *agniṣṭoma*, mentioning the *sāmans* to be chanted in connexion with the relevant rites as well as the *agnicayana*, and giving instructions on what they have to chant, to say and to do to the *udgātar* and his assistants and occasionally also to the other officiants.[240] Although this text is a whole in itself—called *agniṣṭomasya jaiminisūtram* in a colophon—it is, unlike Lāṭyāyana's and Drāhyāyaṇa's Sūtras, not a complete *śrauta* manual; about four fifths are wanting. That a complete Jaiminīya-Śrautasūtra must have existed appears from Bhavatrāta's explanatory work *(vṛtti)* on the whole of it.[241] This valuable commentary which usually quotes Jaimini's *sūtras* in an abbreviated form, allows us not only to restore the original text of many passages, but also to determine the contents of the whole Sūtra with fair precision. It appeared that, in addition to the portion published, there has been a chapter entitled Kalpa which, generally speaking, corresponds to the Maśakakalpasūtra of the Kauthumas and a long chapter named (by Jaimini himself) Paryadhyāya or also Pariśeṣa which is "to remove doubts about the meaning of the Sūtra (the printed text) and the Kalpa (chapter II), and to settle what has not been told there".[242] Both texts which are commented upon by Bhavatrāta have recently been discovered.[243] This Śrautasūtra is in all probability a rather early work; some grammatical peculiarities, the absence of the usual tendency to brevity and the occurrence of motivations and other *brāhmaṇa*like passages[244] point in the same direction. Although it has probably served as the model of

---

Pariśiṣṭa published by SATYAVRATA SĀMAŚRAMIN, Sāma Veda Saṃhitā, II, Calcutta 1876 (B. I.), p. 519.

[238] Published in the collection of Sāmavedic treatises mentioned by CALAND, Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa, p. VI and by B. R. SHARMA, Hoshiarpur 1971.

[239] Edition: D. GAASTRA, Bijdrage tot de kennis van het Vedische ritueel. Jaiminīyaśrautasūtra, Thesis Utrecht 1906; Leiden 1906; with a Dutch translation; cf. also n. 241 below. See also W. CALAND, De literatuur van den Sāmaveda en het Jaiminigṛhyasūtra, Amsterdam Acad. 1905; A. PARPOLA, On the Jaiminīya-śrautasūtra and its annexes, in OS 16 (1967), p. 181; The literature and study of the Jaiminīya Sāmaveda, Helsinki 1973. On the Jaiminīyas also GONDA, V. L., p. 319.

[240] For a detailed survey of the contents see GAASTRA, op. cit., p. XXX.

[241] Announced in 1928 by VEDA VYĀSA, The literature of the Jaiminīyas, in 5 AIOC I, p. 297, and published by PREMNIDHI SHASTRI, Jaiminīyaśrautasūtra-vṛtti of Bhavatrāta, New Delhi 1966 (containing also the text of the *agniṣṭoma* taken over from Miss Gaastra's edition).

[242] For a survey of the contents see PARPOLA, in OS 16, p. 196.

[243] PARPOLA, in OS 16, p. 207; in AO 36, p. 504.

[244] Cf. GAASTRA, op. cit., p. XIII; XXV.

Lāṭyāyana's book[245]—which "in its condensation is more advanced"—the difference between the printed portion and the corresponding part of that work is considerable. It seems that the author was acquainted with Baudhāyana's Śrautasūtra—he prescribes the chanting of the *sāmans* in the several rites in the order found in that work—but not with Āpastamba's,[246] which was known to the author of the Jaiminīya Agniṣṭoma-Prayoga.[247] As far as can be seen from the *agniṣṭoma* portion the author of this Sūtra, while accommodating himself only partially to the Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa, has no doubt been under the influence of the Yajurveda.[248] Baudhāyana for instance was his source for the *madhuparka* ceremony. Nevertheless he was faithful to the sāmavedic traditions which, it seems, attached more importance to conformity in *gānas* than in *mantras*.

The only available Śrautasūtra of the Atharvaveda, the Vaitāna,[249] is not—as was taken for granted by Garbe, Hillebrandt and Bloomfield,[250] an ordinary *śrauta* manual for the use of Atharvavedins. As shown by Caland[251] it appears from the *paribhāṣās* at the beginning of the work that it is a manual for the officiant known as *brahman*—that is the functionary who oversees the ritual acts, accompanies these with formulas and corrects accidents and blunders of the officiants—and his assistants as well as the sacrificer if he is an Atharvavedin. Says VaitS. 1, 1ff.:

"Now (the ritual) for the *śrauta*-sacrifices *(vitāna)*. The *brahman*, knowing the Brahmaveda (Atharvaveda),[252] sits down, when the ritual is performed (by the officiants, viz. the *adhvaryu* etc.), on the south-side (of the sacrificial ground) according to the rule (formulated at KauśS. 3, 5—7), controlling his speech (that

[245] Parpola, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 27; 95. For the mutual relations of these works see also Gaastra, op. cit., p. XIX; XXII.

[246] Kashikar, S. Ś., p. 93.

[247] In manuscript, Oriental Institute Baroda.

[248] Cf. Gaastra, op. cit., p. XXIV; Renou, Écoles, p. 105; Parpola, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 95.

[249] Editions: R. Garbe, Vaitāna Sūtra. The ritual of the Atharvaveda, London 1878; Vishva Bandhu, Bhim Deva, Pitambar Datt, Vaitāna-Śrauta-Sūtra with the commentary called Ākṣepānuvidhi by Somāditya (with an English translation and indices), Hoshiarpur 1967. Translations: R. Garbe, Vaitāna Sūtra (with notes; antiquated), Strassburg 1878; W. Caland, Das Vaitānasūtra des Atharvaveda übersetzt, Amsterdam Acad. 1910 (reprinted 1968); S. N. Ghosal, The Vaitānasūtra, in IHQ 34—36 (serially, ch. 1—18; 19—36; 37—43). See also: M. Bloomfield, On the position of the Vaitāna-sūtra in the literature of the Atharva-Veda, JAOS 11, p. 375; W. Caland, Über das Vaitānasūtra . . ., WZKM 14, p. 115; the same in ZDMG 53, p. 225; 55, p. 265; 57, p. 740; 58, p. 506 (interpretation); D. Bhattacharya, Materials for further study of the Vaitānasūtra, OH 5, p. 13; V. V. Bhide, A plea for a correct translation of the Vaitāna Sūtra, JUPHS 29 (1969), p. 83.

[250] For Garbe see the preceding note, and especially the Preface to the edition; Hillebrandt, Ritualliteratur, p. 35; M. Bloomfield, The Atharva-Veda and Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa, Strassburg 1899, p. 91.

[251] W. Caland, in WZKM 14, p. 115f. (cf. also in ZDMG 53, p. 227).

[252] For this name see Gonda, V. L., p. 268.

is, not speaking anything profane). He accompanies *(anumantrayate)* the oblations that in this manual are indicated with Vedic *mantras* (which are likewise prescribed in this *sūtra*) ... He causes the sacrificer who is consecrated by one who knows (the rites of) the Bhṛgus and Aṅgirases (i.e. the Atharvaveda) to pronounce (the relevant formulas)".[253]

That is to say, this *sūtra* work deals with the *brahmatvam* and, quite intelligibly, also with the duties of other officiants if the *brahman* has to co-operate with them in performing ritual functions. Though essentially identical with the description given in the *śrautasūtras* of the other Vedas, this treatise on the functions of the *brahman cum suis* is not only longer than the sections on the *brahmatvam* in those manuals and full of details not mentioned elsewhere. It is also different in that almost all acts prescribed are accompanied by *mantras* to be pronounced by the *brahman*, the vast majority of the formulas used being quoted from the Atharvaveda. Besides, the *brahman* has, independently of other officiants, to offer some oblations. So the Vaitānasūtra is a collection of ritual directions for the *brahman*—who in respect of his knowledge of the Atharvaveda is explicitly contrasted with the representatives of the other Vedas (VaitS. 11, 2)—and his assistants and especially for one of them, the *brāhmaṇācchaṃsin*.[254] It fits easily in the descriptions of the solemn rites as found in the other *śrautasūtras* and was no doubt composed in order to supply the Atharvaveda with a *sūtra* at the time when its followers felt the need of a distinctive *śrauta* manual to support their double claim to the office of the *brahman* priest and to the equality of their collection of texts *(saṃhitā)* with the other Vedas.

This character of the Vaitāna—which in style and structure is a typical *sūtra* with very few digressions—explains also the incompleteness and more or less synoptical form of its expositions.[255] As to its relation to the Atharvaveda-Saṃhitā it belongs to the Śaunakīya recension, but prescribes also three hymns —quoted in full—that belong to the Paippalāda tradition.[256] It has been supposed[257] that quotations from the Śaunakīya Atharvaveda I—XIX were not borrowed directly from the Saṃhitā. The vast majority of the hymns and

---

[253] This ritual use of the Vaitānasūtra was well known to the author of the commentary on the Atharvaveda who observes (Atharvaveda, ed. Hoshiarpur 1960, I, p. 25): "In the Vaitānasūtra is explained what has to be done by the four officiants *brahman*, *brāhmaṇācchaṃsin*, *āgnīdhraḥ* and *potā* when the rites laid down in the Threefold Veda from the full and new moon ceremonies up to the *ayanas* ... are being performed".

[254] For some other details see GONDA, V. L., p. 269.

[255] Whereas, for instance, the *agnihotra* as described by Āpastamba fills in Dumont's book (L'agnihotra) 53 pages, the relevant chapter of the Vaitāna (VII) occupies only six pages. For a survey of the contents see also KASHIKAR, S. Ś., p. 98.—The Vaitānasūtra is divided into 43 (sub)sections *(kaṇḍikā)* and also into eight *adhyāyas*. However, one of Garbe's manuscripts comprises six more *adhyāyas* which contain the *prāyaścittas*, probably a later addition.

[256] Viz. VaitS. 10, 17: Ppp. 5, 28, 1—3; VaitS. 14, 1: Ppp. 5, 16, 2; 16, 150, 6; 10; 16, 151, 5—7; 16, 152, 5; 6; VaitS. 24, 1: Ppp. 2, 39.

[257] RENOU, Écoles, p. 74.

individual stanzas used in the *anumantraṇa*—from 19, 6, in the description of the *agniṣṭoma*—belong to AVŚ. book XX.[258] The relation between the Sūtra and that book is very close, both texts running to a certain extent parallel. There is much to be said for the assumption that both were compiled at the same time or the Sūtra somewhat later than book XX,[259] which is only found in the Śaunakīya recension. That means that the latter essentially is a so-called *mantrapāṭha*, a book containing the texts of the formulas used—no doubt after the example of domestic manuals where this procedure was less rare—and compiled for and adapted to a definite ritual. Contrary to the normal relation between *śrauta-* and *gṛhyasūtras* the Vaitānasūtra was composed later than Kauśika's manual which it quotes.[260]

The term Vaitāna[261] meaning "relating to the *śrauta* sacrifices" the name—which could have been applied to any *śrautasūtra*—has possibly something to do with the desire of the Atharvavedins to demonstrate the importance of their traditions.[262] Regarding its authorship no positive information is available. In any case, the name Vaitāna cannot denote, in the usual way, the promulgator and the work itself, speaking (1, 3) of "(our) teacher", wishes to remain anonymous. According to tradition[263] it was produced by the Kauśika family. This is however as questionable as the supposition that the author—Kāśyapa ?[264]—was identical with the compiler of the Kauśikasūtra.[265] As to the date of its origin, scholars are unanimous in regarding it as comparatively late; how long a period had at the moment of its composition elapsed after the redaction of Kauśika's work—which also is a rather late compilation—it is impossible to say.

[258] For a survey see CALAND, Vaitānasūtra . . . übersetzt, p. 125.

[259] CALAND, Vaitānasūtra . . ., p. VIII. Eighteen stanzas of AVŚ. XX are not used in VaitS.; probably the ritual for which the *mantra* collection was intended was not in all respects identical with that described in the Vaitānasūtra.

[260] Cf. e.g. VaitS. 1, 19 (KauśS. 3, 4); 10, 19 (KauśS. 45, 11); 11, 4 (KauśS. 60, 17 and 18a); 28, 7 (KauśS. 5, 7).

[261] Other names found in colophons etc. are Vaitāna-Kalpa, or Ātharva(ṇa)-Sūtra (see VISHVA BANDHU, Edition, p. XVII).

[262] According to HILLEBRANDT, op. cit., p. 35 it was perhaps derived from the initial sentence.

[263] See VISHVA BANDHU, op. cit., p. XVIII (cf. the colophons in Somāditya's commentary).

[264] M. BLOOMFIELD, in JAOS 11, p. 377 on the strength of the Mahābhāṣya where the Kauśikasūtra and Kāśyapa's Kalpa are several times mentioned together.

[265] D. BHATTACHARYA, in OH 5, p. 13; for criticism see KASHIKAR, S. Ś., p. 100.

Chapter III

THE GṚHYASŪTRAS

1. General introduction

Simple domestic sacrifices *(gṛhyakarmāṇi)*[1] performed by the head of the family must have been as important in the period of the Ṛgveda as they were in the post-Vedic period. There is even no doubt that part of the rites or elements of other domestic—and even solemn—ceremonial were inherited from the prehistoric ancestors of the Vedic householders. This conclusion may safely be drawn from the many interesting parallels in the rituals of the other Indo-European peoples on one hand, and the largely 'international' character of certain customs and practices on the other.[2] The many striking correspondences between the often complicated Indian, Roman, German, Slavonic and other marriage ceremonies (including relevant terminology)[3] have long since attracted the attention of many scholars. The *sīmantonnayana* (the "dividing of the hair"), according to the majority of the *gṛhyasūtras* a rite to be performed by the husband during the first pregnancy of his wife, is the Indian variant and continuation of an ancient and widespread Indo-European custom to change the hair-dress of a girl or young women on entering a new stage of life (puberty) or a new social position (marriage).[4] The ancient Indian rites and customs regarding disposal and cult of the dead correspond in many respects with the

---

[1] In spite of Gobhilaputra, GSP. 1, 35ff. who explains *gṛhya* as "inmates of the house (wife, sons, daughters etc.)" for the benefit of whom the rites have been established, the term means "domestic".

[2] L. von Schroeder, Die Hochzeitsgebräuche der Esten und einiger anderer finnisch-ugrischer Völkerschaften in Vergleichung mit denen der indogermanischen Völker, Berlin 1888; H. Oldenberg, Die Religion des Veda, Stuttgart and Berlin [4]1923; Keith, R. Ph. V. U., p. 373; Gonda, R. I. I, p. 115.

[3] E. Haas, Die Heiratsgebräuche der alten Inder nach den Gṛhyasūtra, in Weber, I. S. V (1862), p. 267; B. W. Leist, Altarisches Jus gentium, Jena 1889, p. 134; M. Winternitz, Das altindische Hochzeitsrituell nach dem Āpastambīya-Gṛhyasūtra und einigen anderen verwandten Werken. Mit Vergleichung der Hochzeitsgebräuche bei den übrigen indogermanischen Völkern, Denkschriften Akad. Wien 40, Vienna 1892; Caland, in ZDMG 51, p. 130; O. Schrader and A. Nehring, Reallexikon der indogermanischen Altertumskunde, I, Berlin and Leipzig 1917—1923, p. 470; M. J. Dresden, Mānavagṛhyasūtra, Thesis Utrecht 1941, p. 24. Cf. also A. F. Stenzler, in ZDMG 7 (1853) p. 528.

[4] J. Gonda, The sīmantonnayana as described in the gṛhyasūtras, in East and West 7, Rome 1956, p. 12 (= Gonda, S. S. IV, p. 186).

observances of the related peoples.[5] Of the Indian *pradakṣiṇa*, the circumambulation from left to right of a person of object[6] there are so many counterparts in other Indo-European communities that it cannot but be regarded as inherited.[7] Nor is there doubt of the substantial antiquity of the ordinary *bali* ritual which involves, not the use of a ritual fire but merely the placing on the ground of the oblations destined for the divine powers.[8] That many elements of the agricultural rites, often accompanied by charms to promote the growth of the crops, date from hoary antiquity is generally admitted.[9] In course of time changes in the inherited customs as well as cases of incorporation of non-Aryan practices did not fail to occur.

It is therefore not surprising to find in the Ṛgveda references to various events in the ancient Indian family life which can hardly be supposed to have taken place without appropriate rites. The supposition that part of the stanzas of the Sūryāsūkta (ṚV. 10, 85), describing the wedding of Sūryā,[10] the prototype of any marriage on earth, were already in Ṛgvedic times ritually used is very plausible. However, the *saṃhitās* of the Yajurveda devoted to the solemn ceremonies had little scope for references to domestic rites.[11] Although the *brāhmaṇas* discussing *śrauta* ritual make no mention of *gṛhyasūtras* they do refer to *gṛhya* matter.[12] The passage ŚB. 11, 3, 3, 4–7 on the religious student *(brahmacārin)* begging for food presupposes the manner of life recommended for instance at ĀśvGS. 1, 22, 4ff.; the instruction in the recitation of the Sāvitrī (ṚV. 3, 62, 10)—see e.g. ĀśvGS. 1, 21, 5f.—is known to the author of ŚB. 11, 5, 4, 6.[13] The Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa (8, 10, 9) gives the domestic fire the same name as the *gṛhyasūtras* do and describes a ceremony to be performed over it in the style of these manuals.[14] In short, the compilers of the *brāhmaṇas* were acquainted with *gṛhya* rites as well as technicalities and terminology relating to them. But the very fact that the references to subjects treated in the extant *gṛhyasūtras* are no more than exceptional, sporadically appearing in expositions

---

[5] W. Caland, Über Totenverehrung bei einigen der Indo-Germanischen Völker, Amsterdam Acad. 1888; Schrader and Nehring, op. cit., I, p. 18; 123.

[6] E.g. ŚŚS. 4, 16, 10; ĀśvGS. 1, 7, 6; PGS. 1, 5, 1; see also ŚŚS. 7, 5, 4; ĀpŚS. 1, 12, 3; 2, 5, 6; 7, 11, 5; MŚS. 1, 1, 1, 44; ĀśvGS. 1, 17, 7; ŚGS. 1, 7, 11.

[7] W. Caland, Een Indogermaansch lustratie-gebruik, Amsterdam Acad. 1898.

[8] Cf. Schrader and Nehring, op. cit., II, Berlin and Leipzig 1929, p. 136.

[9] W. Mannhardt, Wald- und Feldkulte, Berlin 1875–1877; ²1904–1905; J. G. Frazer, The Golden Bough, abridged edition, London 1957, passim.

[10] See Gonda, V. L., p. 115.

[11] The term *pākayajña* occurs at TS. 1, 7, 1, 3; 6, 2, 5, 4; see also AiB. 3, 40, 2; ŚB. 1, 4, 2, 10.

[12] For a discussion of this point see H. Oldenberg, Introduction to the gṛhyasūtras, S. B. E. XXX, p. IX.

[13] Some more correspondences in Hillebrandt, Rit., p. 23. See also V. M. Apte, in NIA 3, p. 101; 154 whose conclusion that these and other sections in the Gṛhyasūtra are modelled on the corresponding passages in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa is not convincing. Cf. also ŚB. 11, 5, 4, 1ff.

[14] Oldenberg, in S. B. E. XXX, p. XV; XVIII where more references.

of different contents, is one of the main indicia to show that these authors had no knowledge of regular domestic manuals.

If there was no occasion systematically to include *gṛhya* matter in the older Vedic literature, the *gṛhyasūtras* themselves, based on ancient traditions as they to a large extent were, justify the inference that at least part of the most important domestic ceremonies are, as far as their fundamental elements and most characteristic features are concerned, older than the *brāhmaṇas*. Says the author of ĀśvGS. 1, 7, 1:

> "Now various indeed are the (socio-religious) customs *(dharma)* of the (different) regions and the customs of the (different) villages: those one should observe at a wedding (ceremony)".[15]

There is, on the other hand, no doubt that the several domestic manuals presuppose the existence of the allied *śrautasūtras* and that in its generality this literary genre is even based on them.[16] Many books on the domestic ritual are traditionally held to have been composed by the same authority as the *śrautasūtras*. ĀśvGS. 1, 1, 1 is quite explicit:

> *uktāni vaitānikāni gṛhyāṇi vakṣyāmaḥ* "The (rites) based on the spreading (of the three sacred fires, that is, the *śrauta* rites) have been declared; we shall (now) declare domestic (rites)".

The *gṛhyasūtras* usually pass over in silence points of general interest that have already been mentioned in their *śrautasūtra* or confine themselves to cross references. When, at ŚGS. 1, 16, 1ff. (cf. 3, 12) the newly married woman has to sit down on a bull's hide the author states: "'A bull's hide'—this has been declared", namely in ŚŚS. 4, 16, 2:

> "Having spread to the west of the fire the hide of a red bull with its neck part northwards or eastwards and with the hairy side turned upwards ... they sit down thereon".[17]

The *paribhāṣās* of the *śrautasūtra* are at ŚGS. 1, 1, 13 explicitly declared to be, within the limits of possibility, applicable also in the domestic rites, "in consequence of the unity of the ritual".[18] Whereas the *śrāddha* is a *gṛhya* ceremony the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*—the *śrāddha* to be performed on the day of new moon—is as a rule described in the *śrautasūtras*. Some *gṛhyasūtras* however refer explicitly

[15] Cf. also VaikhSmS. 5, 6; PGS. 1, 8, 11ff.; ĀśvGS. 1, 14, 8; 1, 17, 18. See F. Knauer, in Deutsche Literatur-Zeitung 1893, p. 362; 632; and in Festgrusz R. v. Roth, Stuttgart 1893, p. 64 (who injustifiably concludes that there existed *gṛhyasūtras* in that earlier period); B. C. Lele, Some atharvanic portions in the Gṛhyasūtras, Thesis Bonn 1927, p. 43.

[16] Cf. already Oldenberg, in S. B. E. XXIX, p. 5; XXX, p. XXIII; XXXI; Hillebrandt, Rit., p. 20; Gopal, I. V. K., p. 3.

[17] See also ĀpGS. 1, 1, 19; 1, 2, 5 (*darśapūrṇamāsavat tūṣṇīm* "as at the sacrifices of full and new moon, in silence"): ĀpŚS. 1, 11, 6ff.; 2, 12, 7ff.; 2, 14, 1; ŚGS. 1, 1, 12: ŚŚS. 2, 6, 2f.; ŚGS. 1, 3, 17: ŚŚS. 2, 6, 9ff.; ĀśvGS. 2, 5, 3: ĀśvŚS. 2, 6ff.

[18] The text obviously refers to ŚŚS. 1, 1, 6f.

with regard to the former to the *śrauta* texts.[19] There is no denying that the domestic cult as described in the *gṛhya* manuals was to a considerable extent influenced by, and even modelled on, the *śrauta* rites which in some cases run parallel.[20] The full and new moon offerings for instance agree closely in the deities and other points with those of the *śrauta* ritual, except for paps being substituted for the cakes as oblations and a few other details.[21] According to ĀpGS. 1, 2, 10 the ritual based on the *brāhmaṇa*, that is the *śrauta* ritual, can in certain cases hold good as well.[22] It should moreover be remembered that the *gṛhyasūtras* were not only meant for those Aryans who strove for religious merit without maintaining the three fires and performing *śrauta* rites *(anāhitāgni)* but also for the *āhitāgnis*, those who were willing to undertake the great rites requiring a large number of specialized officiants: the *śrauta* and *gṛhya* spheres were not kept strictly separate.[23] Since however fundamental features of the solemn rites must have been based on or borrowed from an ancient simple and 'general' or undifferentiated ritual it is very difficult to make certain about the question as to how far those who first compiled *gṛhya* manuals codified the ancient and genuine rites and traditions of their communities and how far they tried to adapt part of the rites to principles and prescripts prevailing in the *śrauta* ceremonies, how far they elaborated the domestic rites hitherto performed in simple unadorned fashion by means of the abundant liturgical material of the solemn sacrifices.[24]

Anyhow, the differences between both classes of *sūtra* are considerable. The domestic books do not run parallel with, are not based on, *brāhmaṇas* and relations with the *saṃhitās*—especially with those of the Ṛgveda and Sāmaveda and with the exception of that of the Atharvaveda—are far from close. Nor are

---

[19] Cf. ŚGS. 4, 1, 13: ŚŚS. 4, 3ff.; ĀśvGS. 2, 5, 3: ĀśvŚS. 2, 6f.; PGS. 3, 3, 10: KŚS. 4, 1. Other authors of *gṛhyasūtras* inform their readers briefly on the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* without referring to a *śrautasūtra*: GGS. 4, 4, 1f.; KhGS. 3, 5, 35; KauṣGS. 87f.; VaikhSmS. 4, 5f. treats it at great length.

[20] See also CALAND, in GGA 1897, p. 282; 285.

[21] See HILLEBRANDT, Rit., p. 75; KEITH, R. Ph. V. U., p. 361.

[22] See Haradatta's commentary summarized by OLDENBERG, in S. B. E. XXX, p. 254.

[23] Compare e.g. ŚGS. 2, 15, 10 (a reference to *soma* sacrifices); ĀśvGS. 2, 2, 4f. (the *āgrayaṇa* for both categories of sacrificers); 1, 23, 1ff. (choosing officiants, with reference to ĀśvŚS. 9, 3, 20; cf. ĀśvGS. 1, 5, 1). See also GOPAL, in VIJ 1, p. 295.

[24] Cf. also CALAND, in GGA 1897, p. 282; V. M. APTE in Vol. C. Kunhan Raja, Adyar-Madras 1946, p. 234 (APTE's observations in NIA 3, 57 etc. are not always convincing); RENOU, Écoles, p. 186. The influence of the specialized ritualists is also apparent from the occurrence in *gṛhyasūtras* of technical terms that are very usual in both *brāhmaṇas* and *śrautasūtras*, e.g. *āghāra* "sprinkling clarified butter upon the sacred fire" (BGS. 1, 4, 39; KāGS. 25, 8; MGS. 2, 10, 6; VaikhGS. 1, 9 etc.); *abhigharaṇa* "sprinkling with clarified butter" etc. (BGS. 2, 7, 17; ĀpGS. 3, 7, 8 etc.); the *abhyātāna* and other formulas (MGS. 1, 11, 15; HGS. 1, 3, 10) etc. R. GOPAL, in VIJ 1 (1963), p. 293 seems inclined to exaggerate; is there any necessity to believe that all these terms were invented by the authors of the *brāhmaṇas*?

these relations similar to those between the *śrautasūtras* and the *saṃhitās*. The domestic books are only secondarily attached to the basic texts of the schools in which they were produced. As will be explained below the non-ṛgvedic *gṛhyasūtras* draw for their *mantras* on special collections some of which have been preserved.

It has been argued[25] that in spite of the absence in *brāhmaṇas* as well as *gṛhyasūtras* of the term *gṛhya-brāhmaṇa* there must have existed "some *brāhmaṇa* texts which discussed the matters pertaining to the realm of the *gṛhya* ritual, and which were regarded as authoritative by the authors of the *gṛhyasūtras*". However, the text-places adduced in favour of this hypothesis[26] relate to points of generally ritual interest, not to exclusively domestic rites or practices. They only show—and this is in itself not devoid of importance—that the authors of the *gṛhyasūtras* generally speaking were acquainted with numerous *brāhmaṇas* and *brāhmaṇa* places, among them many unknown to us.[27] That they felt impelled now and then to turn to a *brāhmaṇa* for guidance or to corroborate their statements and prescriptions by the authority of such a work is only natural:[28] the very production of the *gṛhyasūtras* was, like that of the *dharma* works, one of the efforts made by the brahmins to codify customs and tradition in accordance with their ideals.[29] It seems even warranted to say that the authors took an active interest in some of the subjects dealt with in the *brāhmaṇas*,[30] and that they, generally speaking, were also acquainted with the teachings of various authorities, many of whom are in their treatises mentioned by name.[31]

[25] GOPAL, I. V. K., p. 19.

[26] BGS. 1, 3, 8; 1, 7, 36; BhGS. 1, 20: 21, 2; ĀpGS. 3, 8, 12; 1, 3, 3; 6, 15, 10; HGS. 1, 24, 7; ĀśvGS. 1, 1, 5.

[27] As to ĀpGS. 1, 3, 3 cf. TB. 1, 5, 2, 3; HGS. 1, 24, 7: TS. 2, 5, 1, 5f. For ĀśvGS. 3, 1 etc.: TĀ. 2, 10 etc. see V. M. APTE, in NIA 3, p. 218. The description of the *upanayana* ceremony in domestic manuals may be compared to the references in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa (e.g. PGS. 2, 2, 13: ŚB. 11, 3, 3, 2; PGS. 2, 7, 6: ŚB. 11, 3, 3, 7; PGS. 2, 2, 6: ŚB. 11, 5, 4, 1 etc.). I hesitate to follow R. GOPAL, in VIJ 1, p. 295 in considering such places as ĀśvGs. 4, 3, 1ff. to have been borrowed verbatim from ŚB. 12, 5, 2, 7 etc.

[28] For the use of *(iti) vijñāyate* (ch. VI, n. 88) see e.g. ĀśvGS. 1, 10, 15 (cf. ŚB. 1, 6, 3, 38); 3, 2, 2; 3, 10, 8; 4, 1, 3; 4, 8, 18; BhGS. 1, 12: 12, 3; cf. also KauśS. 39, 31; for the term *śruti* see MGS. 1, 1, 15; 1, 21, 11; KāGS. 1, 29; 3, 10. These references are, in the opinion of later authors and commentators, to show that all domestic rites are based on *śruti* which however is extinct or has been lost (ĀpDhS. 1, 4, 12, 10 (and Haradatta); Nārāyaṇa, on ĀśvGS. 4, 1, 3; cf. also Sāyaṇa, quoted by WEBER, I. L., p. 94; Aṣṭāvakra, on MGS. 1, 21, 11 *saṃskārāṇāṃ vedamūlaṃ smaraṇam*).

[29] I would ascribe the codification to this aspiration rather than (with WEBER, I. L., p. 20 and SŪRYAKĀNTA, Kauthuma-Gṛhya, Calcutta 1956, p. 107) to the then already impendent obsolescence of the rites.

[30] As to *brāhmaṇas* that are no longer known, GGS. 3, 2, 7 quotes the Rauraki-Brāhmaṇa; BhGS. 3, 18: 86, 11 mentions the Śāṭyāyani-Brāhmaṇa.

[31] For instance, BGS. 1, 3, 15f. makes mention of Ātreya, Āṅgirasa; 1, 4, 44 Bādari; 1, 7, 48 Śāliki; BhGS. 1, 20: 21, 5f. Āśmarathya and Ālekhana; 2, 6: 37,

Although there are therefore no grounds for assuming the existence of 'domestic *brāhmaṇas*'[32] there is on the other hand room for the supposition that the *gṛhyasūtras* extant were preceded by brief texts of, perhaps, the *anvākhyāna* variety.[33] The presence of an exposition of the observances of the *brahmacārin* (the 'religious student')[34] in ĀśvŚS. 8, 14 and of a section on the student's return home *(samāvartana)* in BŚS. 17, 39–44[35] as well as a Kāṭhaka fragment entitled Upanayana-Brāhmaṇa—which in KāṭhGS. 41, 24 is regarded as *śruti*[36]—may probably be taken to point to the circulation of small 'treatises' dealing with some particular *gṛhya* subject. Or to quote Oldenberg: before there existed *gṛhyasūtras* proper, part of the elements "which we find later in the *gṛhya* texts were either already formed or were in the process of formation".[37] It does not indeed seem improbable that both classes of *sūtrakāra* have consciously drawn on the same more or less fixed traditions on some particular ritual. For instance, the prescriptions regarding the reception of a guest—which are obligatory for every householder irrespective of whether he has established the three *śrauta* fires *(āhitāgni)* or only maintains a domestic fire *(anāhitāgni)*—as given in the ṛgvedic ŚŚS. 4, 21, 1ff. and the yajurvedic PGS. 1, 3 resemble each other very much: in the former manual it is inserted because the *soma* sacrifice dealt with in the next chapter involves the respectful reception of the officiants, in the latter because it commonly belongs to the *gṛhya* subjects. The rules to be observed in choosing priests are stated by Śāṅkhāyana in ŚS. 5, 1, 1, by Āśvalāyana in GS. 1, 23, 1.[38] While Śāṅkhāyana deals with the funeral rites in his Śrautasūtra (4, 14),[39] not in his domestic manual, Āśvalāyana includes them in his Gṛhyasūtra (4, 1, 5ff.). The important and no doubt ancient[40] agricultural rite called *āgrayaṇa*, the offering of the first fruits of the season, is, as has already been observed, an important *śrauta* ritual, but it is in essentially the same form a *gṛhya* rite; in the latter case the oblations are offered into the domestic fire.[41] Mention may in this connexion also be made of 'catalogues'

13f. Dhaumya, Asita Turaṅga, Kāvya Dālbhya. For further information see GOPAL, I. V. K., p. 19.

[32] Otherwise: HILLEBRANDT, Rit., p. 23. Places such as ĀśvGS. 1, 1, 4 (see below) are not necessarily to be regarded as "ein Stück Gṛhyabrāhmaṇa".

[33] See p. 524 above. Compare also CALAND, Brāhmaṇa- en sūtra aanwinsten, Amsterdam Acad. 1920, p. 468; 490; C. V. VAIDYA, History of Sanskrit literature, Poona 1930, I, 3, p. 68; RENOU, Écoles, p. 42; V. M. APTE, in BDCRI I, p. 152.

[34] See e.g. KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 370.

[35] See CALAND, B. Ś. S. II, p. III.

[36] For a Śrāddha-Brāhmaṇa see CALAND, Brāhmaṇa- en sūtra aanwinsten, p. 468; 493.

[37] OLDENBERG, in S. B. E. XXX, p. XXII; see also RENOU in JA 236, p. 134 and M. HAUG, The Aitareya Brahmanam, I, Bombay 1863, Introduction, p. 10.

[38] HILLEBRANDT, Rit., p. 22—where more instances are collected—draws attention to ĀśvGS. 1, 23, 5: ĀpŚS. 10, 1, 10f.

[39] Likewise, KŚS. 25, 7; LŚS. 8, 8, 10ff.; (cf. ĀśvGS. 4, 4, 2ff.: LŚS. 8, 8, 34).

[40] Cf. also TS. 5, 7, 2; AiB. 7, 9; KB. 4, 12.

[41] For particulars see HILLEBRANDT, Rit., p. 85; KEITH, R. Ph. V. U., p. 323;

such as ĀśvGS. 4, 3, 1ff.: ŚB. 12, 5, 2, 7 (enumerating the implements to be placed on the dead body). However, how far this literature—which was probably largely oral—had developed when the *gṛhyasūtras* came into existence, it is impossible to say. The above is however not to exclude the possibility of direct borrowing from *śrautasūtras*; several parallels have indeed—not always convincingly—been explained in that way.[42]

A warning against taking formulations such as the above 'Śāṅkhāyana and his Śrauta- and Gṛhyasūtra' too literally will not be out of place here. With regard to Baudhāyana, Āśvalāyana and many others tradition ascribes the authorship of both classes of *sūtra* to the same great figure whose name is borne by both works. Although the question is controversial[43] and decisive evidence is lacking, identity of style and language may in part of the cases turn the scale. In other cases the probabilities are rather in favour of the supposition that the authorship belongs to the school, that is to more than one teacher belonging to the same family or tradition.

In spite of the considerable difference in style, succinctness and subjects or details treated there are in the domestic manuals many parallel, and sometimes even more or less identical passages.[44] While such passages may point to a common original of the above variety, there is nothing that may favour the supposition[45] that once there has existed an 'Ur-Gṛhyasūtra', one common source of all the domestic books. A more acceptable hypothesis seems to be that as soon as one or two—no longer extant—manuals of this class had been composed other schools would not lag behind and proceeded to codify their rituals after the models set by the pioneers. It is however impossible to prove this supposition by irrefutable arguments. Although cases are not rare in which single *sūtras* or sequences of *sūtras* "agree so exactly in different texts that this agreement cannot be ascribed to chance",[46] it is impossible to discover the various stages of the development of this literature and to tell which text or texts—if any—are to be regarded as the 'original source' of the others. It is even extremely difficult to gain an insight into the interdependence of a considerable number of these works. In some cases the mutual relations are clear however.

Gopal, I. V. K., p. 427 and in VIJ 1, p. 294 as well as Nārāyaṇa quoted by Oldenberg, in S. B. E. XXIX, p. 203. For the fire ritual, see Bodewitz, Agnihotra, p. 191.

[42] See Apte, in NIA 3, 217; 238 etc. ĀśvGS. 1, 23, 5 and ĀpŚS. 10, 1, 10f., which are word for word identical, may have orally circulated in circles of ritualists.

[43] G. Bühler, in S. B. E. II, p. XV (Āśvalāyana etc. are patronymics and family names); Oldenberg, in S. B. E. XXX, p. XXXI (in this case tradition not reliable); Gopal, I. V. K. p. 6 and Kashikar, S. Ś., p. 152 (contra Oldenberg).

[44] Oldenberg, in S. B. E. XXX, p. XXXVII already mentioned the *sūtras* dealing with the *vṛṣotsarga* (setting a bull at liberty): ŚGS. 3, 11; PGS. 3, 9; KGS. (LGS.) 59, and some sentences in the section on the marriage rites in PGS. 1, 4, 1—5: ŚGS. 1, 5, 1—5. See also Hillebrandt, Rit., p. 22.

[45] Discussed by Oldenberg, in Weber, I. S. 15, p. 9; S. B. E. XXIX, p. 5; XXX, p. XXXVII; Knauer, GGS. II, p. 46; Hillebrandt, Rit., p. 22.

[46] Oldenberg, in S. B. E. XXX, p. XXXVII.

The Khādira-Gṛhyasūtra is a "recast" of the likewise sāmavedic Gobhila-Gṛhyasūtra.[47] But in spite of the bonds of affinity with which the manual of the Jaiminīyas is linked with them, this text has taken its *mantras* from another source.[48] The mutual resemblance of the yajurvedic manuals of the Mānava, Kāṭhaka and Vārāha schools is so great that they may in places create the impression of being recensions of one common original,[49] but about the identity of such an original we grope in the dark. Generally speaking it is in cases of more or less identical passages not possible to decide where A has borrowed from B, B from A or A and B from C, or from X. There is no doubt that the fact that manuals affiliated to the same Veda[50]—and especially the same *śākhā*—give evidence of a closer affinity can to a considerable extent be ascribed to the possibility—mentioned also by commentators[51]—to borrow rites or parts of rites that are not treated in the own manual from other *gṛhyasūtras*, preferable from those that belong to the same Veda.

These manuals, in which the authors have summed up the *gṛhya* rituals systematically and comprehensively, are compilations rather than compositions[52] and no doubt products of prominent teachers adhering to the several Vedic schools,[53] who individually amplified the common and chief or central subjects by more or less accessary matter. Generally speaking, these authors have drawn their material—*mantras* as well as rules and prescripts—from various earlier sources.[54] As already observed, they must have included many genuine common and occasionally also particular traditions of the Aryan communities. These were not homogeneous and most of the differences between the works of these *sūtrakāras* represent the views of their schools on minute points or the relative importance of individual rites as well as variations in local customs or different opinions of authorities. That they draw on a floating mass of more or less common material—part of which was to survive for many centuries—may be inferred from places such as the above ĀśvGS. 1, 7, 1 as well as ĀpGS. 1, 1, 1:

[47] Oldenberg, l. cit. and in S. B. E. XXIX, p. 371f.; Knauer, GGS. II, p. 38.

[48] Caland, J. G. S., p. XI.

[49] Renou, in JA 1939, p. 633; Madhusudan Kaul, L. G. S. I, p. 10; Raghu Vira, Vārāha-Gṛhyasūtra, Lahore 1932, p. 16; Rolland, R. D. V., p. 36; Sūryakānta, op. cit., p. 67; Gopal, I. V. K., p. 36.

[50] For the ṛgvedic *sūtras* see Sehgal, Ś. G. S., p. 36; Gopal, I. V. K., p. 33; for the *gṛhya* works of the Baudhāyana, Bhāradvāja, Āpastamba and Hiraṇyakeśin schools see Winternitz, in WZKM 4, p. 202 and Das altindische Hochzeitsrituell, Vienna Acad. 1892, p. 5; Gopal, I. V. K., p. 35.

[51] See Sūryakānta, op. cit., p. 8.

[52] See also V. M. Apte, in NIA 3, p. 154; Renou, in JA 236, p. 134. Notice also the occurrence of repetitions etc.: Hillebrandt, Rit., p. 21.

[53] This appears from references to authorities recognized in the school (thus in JGS. 1, 23: 14, 11 the name of Jaimini Talavakāra heads the list of the teachers of the Veda) or to basic texts as well as from *pratīkena* quotations. The Jaiminīya-Gṛhyasūtra for instance cites the initial words of the *mantra* of the Jaiminīya-Saṃhitā; see also Caland, J. G. S., p. VIIIf. For the ṛgvedic *gṛhyasūtras* see Sehgal, Ś. G. S., p. 36.

[54] See also Knauer, G. G. S. II, p. 26ff.; V. M. Apte, in NIA 3, p. 243.

atha karmāṇy ācārādyāni gṛhyante "Now are considered those rites which are (based on) customary conduct (or established usage) and so on",

PGS. 1, 8, 11; ĀśvGS. 1, 14, 8:

"And what (the people in) the villages tell them, that they should do" (marriage rites); "And whatever aged brahmin women, whose husbands and children are alive, teach (sanction) that let them do".

Elsewhere it is the practice of the integer and respectable expert Veda interpreters *(śiṣṭācāra)* which should be followed.[55] Whether or not individual rites were inherited from hoary antiquity or were in 'historical times' "developed as the special possession of individuals"[56]—not all customs and practices detailed in the domestic books can claim the same age—the very fact that rites incorporated in *gṛhya* manuals[57] are also recommended in other works[58] furnishes additional grounds for presuming that they were widely practised.

Only occasionally an author makes an explicit statement about his intentions. In his section on the solemnization of marriages Āśvalāyana purposes stating what is commonly accepted (GS. 1, 7, 2). The elaborate paragraph 1, 1, 4 in the beginning of the same work is no doubt to prove, by means of quotations from the Ṛgveda, the validity of the simple *gṛhya* rites and to gain their full recognition:[59]

"Even he who only puts a piece of wood (on the fire) full of belief, should think, 'Here I offer a sacrifice, adoration to that (deity) . . .'".

Once they had systematized their material in accordance with the principles followed in the *śrauta* works with which these manuals claimed to form coherent wholes they remained true to the schemes and models which they had adopted. Being in their generality posterior in respect of language and (where verses are inserted)[60] of metre to the *śrautasūtras* they exhibit signs of a development of their style; the main manuals tend to increasing succinctness, the later works show many traces of deterioration. It would be hazardous to correlate these stylistic phenomena with a chronological reality in respect of which certainty is not in sight.

A few words remain to be said on the relations between the *gṛhyasūtras* and the *dharmasūtras* which in the cases of the Baudhāyana, Āpastamba, Hiraṇyakeśin and Vaikhānasa[61] schools are successive portions of the same *kalpasūtra*. Being only nominally affiliated to the Vedic schools that are 'reflected'

---

[55] GGS. 3, 3, 29; 3, 5, 38; VaikhSmS. 3, 21. For a definition of a *śiṣṭa* see BDhŚ. 1, 1, 5f.

[56] OLDENBERG, in S. B. E. XXX, p. XXI.

[57] Which need not always mean traditionally domestic ritual.

[58] See e.g. BĀU. 6, 4, 26: ŚGS. 1, 24, 1ff.; PGS. 1, 17, 1—4; GGS. 2, 8, 14—17.

[59] Cf. also ŚGS. 2, 17, 2.

[60] See OLDENBERG, in S. B. E. XXX, p. XXXV.

[61] See J. D. M. DERRETT, Dharmaśāstra, in Vol. IV of this History, p. 29f.; 39; GOPAL, I. V. K., p. 7.

by the domestic manual, the *dharma* books are concerned with the social duties and relations of the Aryan classes in general. Incorporating many subjects that are foreign to the domestic books, they lay down, with a view to spiritual well-being, rules and regulations for social behaviour without limiting their outlook to the customs of their respective schools. When therefore both classes of *sūtra* come occasionally to deal with the same subjects they view these from different angles. In this case directions given in one division of the corpus could be omitted or condensed in the other. Generally speaking, *dharma* books often inform their readers of the obligation to observe definite rules, rites or customs and of the exact dates or time for rites to be performed but refer as to particulars concerning the performance to the 'ritual precepts' *(vidhi)*, that is, according to the commentators, the *gṛhyasūtras*. Whereas, for instance, the *gṛhyasūtras* state the customs and prescriptions to be observed in performing the ritual cohabitation ('impregnation', *garbhādhāna*) and the *mantras* to be pronounced on that occasion, in short, the procedure, the *dharma* works add many details, among them more precise indications of the suitable time—not only from the astrological point of view but also in relation to the wife's menses; moreover, they enter into a discussion of the question as to whether this ritual act is a *saṃskāra* of the unborn child or of the expectant mother.[62] In touching on the gift to be presented by the bridegroom to the father of his bride (ĀśvGS. 1, 6, 4) ĀpDhS. 2, 6, 13, 12 states that it must be returned and that there is no question of a sale. In those cases in which both *sūtras* were the work of the same author or at least of related authors according to a common plan various details could to a certain extent be divided between both parts of the corpus.[63] Thus in Āpastamba's work a portion of the subject-matter generally dealt with in the domestic books, viz. all rules bearing on the duties of men rather than on domestic offerings, were reserved for the Dharmasūtra with the result that the Gṛhyasūtra is as short and terse as possible.[64]

---

[62] Cf. KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 201. As to the *upanayana* etc. see BATAKRISHNA GHOSH, in IC 8, p. 227.

[63] BDhŚ. 1, 2, 3, 15 and 2, 8, 15, 9 contain references to BGS. 2, 5, 17 and 2, 11 (see also G. BÜHLER, in S. B. E. XIV, p. XXXI).

[64] G. BÜHLER, The sacred laws of the Āryas, I, S. B. E. II, ²Oxford 1896, p. XIII. Compare also J. JOLLY, Das Dharmasūtra des Vishṇu und das Kāṭhakagṛhyasūtra, SB München 1879, II, p. 22 (cf. also J. J. MEYER, in WZKM 35, p. 49). For relations between MGS. and MDhŚ. see P. VON BRADKE, in ZDMG 36, p. 417; for those between BhGS. and Gautama-Dharmaśāstra, SALOMONS, Bhāradvāja, p. XIV.

2. *The contents of the gṛhyasūtras*

The domestic rites *(gṛhyakarmāṇi)*[1] are in many respects more closely related to everyday life than the solemn ceremonies. Enacted by the householder—or by his representatives (wife, son, a brahmin priest)—in the family circle without solemnities they are much simpler and less expensive. On the other hand, covering a wide field of human effort and interest, they comprise all rituals that have in some way or other a beneficial effect on life and health, welfare and happiness of the members of the family. The *gṛhyasūtras* are accordingly a codification of rules, formulas, and rites—most of them long practised—concerned with the orderly progress of an individual life—or rather, of a life as was the ideal of the brahmin authors[2]—and with all important events that naturally occur in such a life. These rites are also known as *pākayajña* (ŚGS. 1, 1, 1) or *gṛhyasthālīpākānāṃ karma* (PGS. 1, 1, 1): the former term, sometimes explained as "simple sacrifice"[3] can be an abbreviation of *sthālīpāka* contained in the latter and denoting "a dish of rice or barley boiled in milk", the complete expression meaning "a domestic sacrifice involving the offering of such a dish". Properly speaking this term is too narrow because it does neither include the numerous offerings of sacrificial butter nor the many observances and ceremonies taught in the *gṛhyasūtras* which do not involve a sacrifice. The *pākayajñas* are in part of the *sūtras* divided into four or—in the minority of cases—seven[4] classes, the commonest division being *huta* ("offered into the fire"), *ahuta*, *prahuta* and *prāśita* ("eaten"),[5] that is, respectively, oblations made by performing the fire ritual, those offered in a *bali* ritual, or in a sacrifice to the deceased Fathers and those deposited as an offering in a brahmin. With the exception of Baudhāyana the texts do not however keep to this, largely artificial, classification.

The domestic rites—at first sight a rather heterogeneous collection[6]—are of two kinds.[7] First there are the *saṃskāras*,[8] the so-called sacraments. Literally

---

[1] Thus GGS. 1, 1, 1; ĀśvGS. 1, 1, 1 *gṛhyāṇi*.

[2] Idealism sometimes led to prescriptions such as PGS. 2, 5, 13 "Let him live forty-eight years as a student for the (four) Vedas".

[3] Cf. A. Stenzler, Indische Hausregeln, I, 2, Leipzig 1865, p. 2; Oldenberg, in S. B. E. XXX, p. XXIII, n. 2. On a *pākayajña* as "short sacrificial worship" see VārGS. 1, 2. Rolland, R. V. D., p. 20 translates "sacrifice de maturité".

[4] BGS. 1, 1, 1: *huta*, *prahuta*, *āhuta (sic)*, *śūlagava*, *bali* offerings, the *pratyavarohaṇa* and the *aṣṭakāhoma*.

[5] See ŚGS. 1, 5, 1; 1, 10, 7; PGS. 1, 4, 1; for particulars see Oldenberg, in S. B. E. XXX, p. XXIV, and compare Hillebrandt, Rit., p. 41.

[6] Macdonell's (H. S. L., p. 186) characterization "collection of spells" may create misunderstanding.

[7] Compare, in general, Hillebrandt, Rit., p. 41; Keith, R. Ph. V. U., p. 358; Kane, H. Dh. II, p. 188; V. M. Apte, Social and religious life in the gṛhyasūtras, [2]Bombay 1954; Gonda, R. I. I, p. 115; and the synoptical survey in S. B. E. XXX, p. 299.

[8] See R. B. Pandey, Hindu saṃskāras, Banaras 1949. There are forty *saṃskāras*;

meaning "making perfect or fit for a certain purpose" the *saṃskāras* are to consecrate an individual and to enable him to overcome the risks of a new stage in his life. Covering all important phases of human existence from conception until death and beyond they make the individual gradually approach the state of the 'twice-born', reach it and continue in it. While oblations play only a secondary part or are even omitted altogether, the element of purification is often obvious. The so-called bodily sacraments *(śārīrāḥ saṃskārāḥ)* ranging from impregnation *(niṣeka)* to marriage are eighteen[9] in number, but only in the very late Vaikhānasa-Sūtra these eighteen are dealt with completely.[10] According to the enumeration in the beginning of that work (1, 1) they are the following:[11] impregnation; cohabitation during the period (twelve or sixteen days) after the wife's menstruation (considered favourable for conception *(ṛtusaṃgamana)*);[12] the rite to secure conception *(garbhādhāna)*; the rite to secure the birth of a male child *(puṃsavana)*,[13] the parting of (the wife's) hair *(sīmantonnayana)*[14] to be performed in the third or fourth (or sometimes a later) month of the first pregnancy after (or before) the *puṃsavana*; the Viṣṇubali, enjoined only in a few works[15]—being performed in the eighth month of pregnancy it is to remove evil influences from the unborn child and to promote an easy delivery of the expectant mother; the birth ceremonies *(jātakarman)*,[16] on the different details as well as the order of the components of which there is great difference in the *gṛhyasūtras*, four components being as a rule distinguished, viz. the rite for securing length of days *(āyuṣya)*, the production of intellect *(medhājanana)*, the giving of the breast to the child *(stanapratidhāna)* and

---

twenty-two of them are sacrifices, viz. the five daily sacrifices *(mahāyajña)*, some other *pākayajñas* and *śrauta* rites. For a complete enumeration see VaikhSmS. 1, 1.

[9] Eighteen is an often used round and typical number. A complete enumeration (see KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 195) includes six or seven more, some of them rare or more or less identical in scope. Marriage, birth rites, naming, *cūḍākarma*, and *upanayana* are mentioned everywhere, *puṃsavana* and some others almost everywhere.

[10] VaikhSmS. 3, 8—3, 15; 3, 18—19; 3, 22—23; 2, 3—17; 3, 1—4. Hence also references to sixteen or thirteen *saṃskāras*.

[11] For text-places and other details on the *saṃskāras* see especially KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 195.

[12] However, at 6, 2 *ṛtusaṃgamana* and *niṣeka* are identified; see also CALAND, on VaikhSmS. 1, 1, Transl., p. 1, n. 18.

[13] This is usually the first rite dealt with in the *sūtras*; ĀśvGS. 1, 13, 1 refers to a *garbhālambhana* rite before the *puṃsavana*.

[14] Which originally had nothing to do with pregnancy: J. GONDA, in East and West 7 (Rome 1956), p. 12 (= S. S. IV, p. 186); R. C. HAZRA, in ABORI 37, p. 144 (on two ancient *gāthās* quoted in some *gṛhyasūtras* in connexion with this rite; not in all respects convincing).

[15] BGS. 1, 11; VaikhSmS. 3, 13; cf. KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 226.

[16] J. S. SPEYER, Jātakarman, Thesis Leiden 1872 (in Latin, utilizing also *paddhatis* and commentaries). In the case of a girl these ritual acts may, it is true, be performed but—as all *saṃskāras* from birth to *cūḍākarma*—without the accompanying *mantras* (ĀśvGS. 1, 15, 10). As to education etc.: A. S. ALTEKAR, Education in ancient India, Benares 1934.

the giving of the names *(nāmakaraṇa)*[17]—one of which is secret in order to prevent injury through its use by enemies—; (the rite mentioned last which is often prescribed immediately on birth is at VaikhSm. 3, 19 treated separately after the next one);[18] the getting-up of the mother from childbed *(utthāna)*; the first feeding with solid food *(annaprāśana)*; the ceremony to be performed when the householder returns from a journey *(prāvāsāgamana)*, like the following, viz. the increasing of the rice-balls (*piṇḍavardhana*, i.e. the feeding of the boy together with relatives, learned brahmins and a benediction pronounced by the latter) prescribed in the Vaikhānasa and elsewhere,[19] but other texts have instead the first going out of the child *(niṣkramaṇa)*[20] or the showing of the sun *(ādityadarśana)*; the worship of the moon by the father in the presence of his son;[21] the rite of piercing the lobes of the child's ear *(karṇavedha)*;[22] thereafter the tonsure (*cūḍākarma*, *cūḍākaraṇa*, or *caula*, i.e. the first cutting of the boy's hair),[23] which according to many *sūtrakāras* is to be performed in the third year of his life; the introduction of the boy as a 'novice' to a teacher, that is, the initiation into the study of the Veda *(upanayana)*, a most important *saṃskāra*, the Indian variant of the old and widespread puberty and initiation ceremonies;[24] the boy's undertaking of the observances relating to the study of the Veda *(vedavrata)*; the ceremony of the opening of the annual course of study; the pupil's finishing the study of the Veda, the bath taken at the end of his studentship and his returning home *(samāvartana)*; the complicated marriage ceremonies—the most important of all—which, as a rule dealt with at length, comprise *inter alia* the following elements:[25] the election of the bride; the wooers' going to the house of the girl; the sacrifice to be performed when her father has given his assent; the bathing of the girl; the bridegroom's being escorted to her house; the presentation of ceremonial gifts (a new garment, a

---

[17] Cf. KANE, in IHQ 14, p. 224.

[18] Cf. also KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 234.

[19] "How the father should greet his children when returning from a journey": ĀśvGS. 1, 15, 9; PGS. 1, 17, 5f.; GGS. 2, 8, 21 etc.

[20] Cf. BGS. 2, 2; PGS. 1, 17; MGS. 1, 19; KāṭhGS. 37, 1.

[21] GGS. 2, 8, 1ff.; KhGS. 2, 3, 1ff.

[22] BGŚS. 1, 12 (in the seventh or eighth month); see KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 252.

[23] As already observed the rite is performed for girls without the *mantras*: ŚGS. 1, 28, 22; ĀśvGS. 1, 17, 19. Cf. J. KIRSTE, Indogermanische Gebräuche beim Haarschneiden, Analecta Graeciensia 1893 (partly out of date).

[24] See e.g. K. GLASER, Der indische Student, in ZDMG 66, p. 1; CALAND, in ZDMG 52, p. 425f. (interpretation); J. GONDA, Change and continuity in Indian religion, ch. VIII—X, passim.

[25] See E. HAAS, Die Heiratsgebräuche der alten Inder nach den Gṛhyasūtra, in WEBER, I. S. V, p. 267; M. WINTERNITZ, Das altindische Hochzeitsrituell nach dem Āpastambīya-Gṛhyasūtra . . ., Denkschriften Akad. Wien 40, Vienna 1892; WEBER, Vedische Hochzeitssprüche, in I. S. V, p. 177; J. B. CHAUDHURI, The position of wives other than the first in the Vedic ritual, IHQ 17 (1941), p. 180; 492; A. CHATTOPADHYAY, Some social aspects in the Āpastamba-Gṛhyasūtra, in IA 3, 2 (1967), p. 37 (especially on the marriage ritual).

mirror, etc.)[26] by the bridegroom to the bride and some other acts to be performed after his arrival (he anoints her, girds her with a rope);[27] the respectful reception offered to the bridegroom *(argha)*; a ceremonious sacrifice; the seizing of the bride's hand by the bridegroom *(pāṇigrahaṇa)*; the formulas "This am I, that are you; that are you, this am I . . . So be devoted to me. Well let us marry . . ." to be pronounced by the bridegroom; the treading on the stone *(aśmāropaṇa)*, to be performed by bride and bridegroom to the accompaniment of the words ". . . be firm like a stone";[28] the threefold[29] circumambulation *(pradakṣiṇa)* of the fire, an essential part of the ceremonies which in some texts[30] takes place alternately with offerings of baked grain *(lājahoma)*; the seven steps *(sapta padāni)*, an ever recurring element of these ceremonies:[31] the couple must step forward preferably in the (auspicious) easterly or northeasterly directions to the accompaniment of seven *mantras* ". . . for offspring, . . . for prosperity, . . . for welfare . . ., be a friend of the seven steps" (by this essential rite the marriage becomes irrevocable); the departure of the couple to their new home *(prayāṇa)*; the ceremonies on entering the new home.[32]

As may already appear from some of the observations made in the above survey the differences between the individual *gṛhyasūtras* are considerable. They concern not only innumerable details—among these the variable length of the sections devoted to the same subject, the description of the requisites, or the use of different *mantras* in the same ceremony[33]—, but also the rites adopted or omitted and the very order in which the rites are dealt with. The general order of arrangement being conditioned by the subject-matter, viz. the ritual duties of the Aryan householder, most *gṛhyasūtras*[34] begin with the marriage ceremonies and then go on to treat those that are connected with pregnancy, birth, education etc.; then the circle can begin again. Some works[35] however commence the round of life at another point, viz. the beginning of a youth's

---

[26] Cf. S. A. DANGE, Adornment as a protective measure in the Vedic ritual, Volume Mirashi, Nagpur 1965, p. 87.

[27] See e.g. ŚGS. 1, 12, 3ff.; PGS. 1, 4, 12; ĀpGS. 2, 4, 8.

[28] Cf. e.g. DRESDEN, M. G. S., p. 51; J. J. MEYER, Trilogie altindischer Mächte und Feste der Vegetation, Zürich and Leipzig 1937, I, p. 57, n. 1.

[29] At MGS. 1, 10, 18 they are led four times round the fire; the same text seems to disconnect this rite from the next, but see DRESDEN, M. G. S., p. 52, on 1, 10, 19.

[30] BGS. 1, 4, 25ff.; HGS. 1, 20, 3ff.; VārGS, 14, 17ff.; cf. KāṭhGS. 25, 34.

[31] See J. JOLLY, Über einige indische Hochzeitsgebräuche, in Album H. Kern, Leiden 1903; H. Ch. PATYAL, The saptapadī rite, BDCRI 35 (1976), p. 104 (distinguishing between a ṛgvedic, yajurvedic, sāmavedic and atharvanic tradition).

[32] See e.g. CALAND, in ZDMG 51, p. 133; J. J. MEYER, in WZKM 46, p. 87.

[33] E. g. in the prescriptions regarding the obligation of the newly married husband to show his wife one or more stars: BGS. 1, 5, 10—14; ŚGS. 1, 17, 3f.; ĀśvGS. 1, 7, 22; PGS. 1, 8, 19f.

[34] ĀśvGS. 1, 5; ŚGS. 1, 5; BGS. 1, 1, 13; ĀpGS. 1, 2, 12; PGS. 1, 4; GGS. 2, 1; KhGS. 1, 3.

[35] BhārGS. 1, 1; HGS. 1, 1, 1; ĀgnGS. 1, 1, 1; VaikhGS. deals with initiation etc. in 2, 3—17, with marriage in 3, 1—4, with conception etc. in 3, 8ff.

student-life. Others again deviate from both orders of arrangement.[36] The regular order of the *saṃskāras* is sometimes interrupted. Thus ŚGS. 1, 26, being an enumeration of the constellations in the circle travelled by the moon *(nakṣatra)*, is a sort of appendix to 1, 25, 5 and 6[37] where sacrifices to the *nakṣatras* are prescribed on the occasion of the *utthāna* ceremony:

> "And let him offer oblations to the lunar day *(tithi)* of (the child's) birth and to three constellations with their (presiding) deities. Let him place in the middle the oblation to that constellation under which (the child) has been born; the deity, however, is constantly to precede (the corresponding *nakṣatra*)".

Some other works insert at this place the rules to be observed by the father on returning from a journey.[38] In the Sūtra of the Vaikhānasas the regular order of the 'sacraments' is interrupted in order to add to the naming of the child the rules for the name-day rite which is to make his years increase (*varṣavardhana* 3, 20 and the so-called *śatābhiṣeka*, 3, 21). Āśvalāyana, who treats the wedding proper rather succinctly (GS. 1, 5–7), does not proceed to mention the rules for the pregnancy rites (1, 13) before dwelling, not only on the journey of the newly married couple to their home, but also on the cult of the domestic fire (1, 9) that has its origin in the nuptial fire which has been taken along with them[39]— the oblations of cooked food on the days of full and new moon, the ritual of the animal sacrifice and the so-called *caitya* sacrifice (1, 12).[40] Hiraṇyakeśin deals with the domestic fire[41] and the rites concerned with house-building at the end of chapter I between the first cohabitation and the *sīmantonnayana* (GS. 1, 23, 11–25, 4 and 2, 1). Jaimini inserts (at 1, 6) the rules concerning the *śrāddha*[42] which has to precede every *saṃskāra* between the *puṃsavana* and the *jātakarma* ritual.

Among those *saṃskāras* which have not been mentioned in the above survey because they do not occur in the enumeration of the Vaikhānasas are a ceremony before the wife's confinement—where the Vaikhānasas prescribe the Viṣṇubali— "to secure a quick deliverance" (ĀpGS. 6, 14, 13) and the first shaving of a boy (*godāna* or, sometimes, *keśānta*), mostly performed in his sixteenth year—the procedure is that of the *cūḍākaraṇa* with a few differences.[43]

An instance of the frequent differences in order occurring in passages on the

---

[36] MGS. 1, 1 and KāṭhGS. 1, 1 (LGS. 1, 1) begin with the observances *(vrata)* of the student, to continue the round of life with the marriage rites and to end with the initiation of the youth; VārGS. 2, 1 begins with the birth ritual; JGS. 1, 5 begins with the *puṃsavana* and ends with the marriage rites.

[37] The commentator Nārāyaṇa designates it as an interpolated *(kṣepaka)* section.

[38] ĀpGS. 6, 15, 12f.; PGS, 1, 18.

[39] ĀśvGS. 1, 8, 5; ĀpGS. 2, 5, 13; KhGS. 1, 5, 1.

[40] A *caitya* is a place of religious worship (outside the house of the worshipper); see Gonda, R. I. I, p. 318; 326.

[41] HGS. 1, 26, omitted in Mātṛdatta's commentary and possibly an interpolation.

[42] See below.

[43] See e.g. ŚGS. 1, 28, 18ff.; ĀśvGS. 1, 18; PGS. 2, 1, 3f.; MGS. 1, 21, 13ff. etc.

same ritual is furnished by ŚGS. 2, 1 and PGS. 2, 2ff.; in the former text the topics dealt with are successively: the time of the initiation, the girdle to be given to the student, the initiation rite, the pupil's duties, in the latter the time, the initiation, the duties and the girdle etc., and again the time.

Some differences in details were no doubt largely determined by differences in local traditions or peculiarities of prominent families. Thus there is a great divergence of opinions about the number of locks of hair to be left on the head in the *cūḍākaraṇa* ceremony and the place of the head where they are to be left. Most *sūtras* observe that these details—such as one, three, or five locks, a lock on the right side etc.—depend on family usage (*kuladharma*),[44] KāṭhGS. 40, 2ff. stating that the Vasiṣṭhas keep a lock on the right side, that the Bhṛgus shave the entire head, etc., while persons of other families keep some locks simply because it is an auspicious sign or family usage. Notwithstanding these references to family traditions the *gṛhyasūtras*, dealing with the ideal domestic life, provide their readers only with indistinctive systematic arrangements, never with personal peculiarities.

There is an unmistakable tendency of the *saṃskāras* to take priority of the other rites. Yet, not all manuals begin with the 'sacraments'.[45] Some authors preface the ritual proper by a 'general outline' of the domestic sacrifices,[46] observations on the sacred domestic fire,[47] or on the general division of the *gṛhya* rites.[48] In part of the texts these subjects as well as rules for the regular morning and evening oblations *(agnihotra)*—the domestic counterpart of the *śrauta* fire ritual:[49] it is expressly stated that the one who has set up his domestic fire is identical with the *āhitāgni* of the solemn rites[50]—the *bali* oblations,[51] the sacrifices on the days of full and new moon and the sacrifices of cooked food *(sthālīpāka)* precede the *saṃskāras* in different order, but in other works they are treated further on, by preference in connexion with the marriage ritual.

The other rites treated in the *gṛhyasūtras* are for the greater part popular performances, customs and ceremonies that, being regarded as having intrinsic validity and hence as being sacred, had been recognized, formalized and more or less idealized by the brahmin authorities to whom we owe this literature. This is not to say that the *gṛhya* books incorporate the complete mass of popular customs. There is on one hand no evidence whatever that all rites incorporated were scrupulously observed by all householders everywhere, but on the other hand every probability that what we have is only a selection.[52] Many practices

[44] Cf. e.g. BGS. 2, 4, 17; ĀśvGS. 1, 17, 18; KhGS. 2, 3, 30.
[45] See the notes 34 and 35 above.
[46] ĀpGS. 1, 1 *(paribhāṣās)*; KhGS. 1, 1; GGS. 1, 1.
[47] ŚGS. 1, 1; PGS. 1, 1.
[48] ĀśvGS. 1, 1; an enumeration in VaikhGS. 1, 1.
[49] See BhParS. 188. Cf. OLDENBERG, in S. B. E. XXX, p. XXVII and KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 678.
[50] HGS. 1, 26, 3; and cf. ĀgnGS. 2, 7, 2; see also BhGS. 3, 18 (= ĀgnGS. 2, 7, 9).
[51] See below.
[52] Cf. ĀśvGS. 1, 7, 1 quoted above (p. 554) and HILLEBRANDT, Rit., p. 21.

that had no direct bearing upon the welfare of the family or did not involve sacrificial rites were ignored or reserved for the *dharma* literature. Unlike the solemn ceremonies the domestic rites are uncomplicated, less related to myths and 'philosophy', and not regarded as part of the 'revelation'. There is no doubt that part of those cases in which the authors are unanimous are here also due to common tradition or to mutual borrowing. Differences can mainly be attributed to variations in local customs or to differences of traditions prevalent in the Vedic *śākhās* to which these *sūtra* works were affiliated. The differences between the texts may consequently be so wide that rites described in one *sūtra* are absent in another.

The following are rites mentioned in a considerable number of texts. In dealing with house-building[53] some *sūtras* pay attention to the selection of the site; KhGS. 4, 2, 6ff.:

"A brahmin should select the site for building his house on white ground, a *kṣatriya* on red, a *vaiśya* on black. (The ground) should be even, covered with grass, not saline, not dry. Water should flow off there to the north-west. (Plants) with milky juice or with thorns or (also) acid plants should not be there. (Soil) on which *darbha* grass grows brings spiritual pre-eminence; big sorts of grass, strength; tender grass, cattle . . ."[54]

In this connexion some texts add the rites to be observed on entering the new house, on leaving it when one goes on a journey or returns home, a few are also concerned with the water-barrel which is to be put up; PGS. 3, 5, 1f.:

"Now (follows) the putting up of the water-barrel. To the north-east he (the householder) digs a pit like (the pit for) the sacrificial post, strews into it *kuśa* grass, unhusked grains, fruits of the soap-tree, and other auspicious things; and therein he establishes the water-barrel with (the words), 'Thou art the sea'".[55]

That there are several ceremonies relating to cattle and agriculture is not surprising. The formulas to be pronounced over the cows[56] when they go away to their pasture-grounds and which are to commit them to Pūṣan, the divine protector of the herds, the formulas used on their return and entering the stable—(ŚGS. 3, 9, 3):

"They whose udders with four holes are full of delicious (drink) and clarified butter *(ghee)* must be milk-givers to us; (they must be) many in our stable, rich in clarified butter"—

suffice by themselves; no sacrifice is prescribed.[57] Other rites relating to cattle are the 'spit-ox' sacrifice *(śūlagava)*, akin in execution to its *śrauta* counterpart, viz. the offering of an ox in spring or autumn for propitiating Rudra—

[53] Cf. M. Winternitz, in Mitteilungen Anthrop. Ges. Wien 17 (1887), p. 37; M. Haberlandt, ibidem, p. 42.

[54] See also ĀśvGS. 2, 7; GGS. 4, 7, 1.

[55] See also ĀpGS. 7, 17, 8f. (different in details).

[56] Cf. M. A. Muusses, Koecultus bij de Hindoes, Thesis Utrecht 1920, p. 24.

[57] Likewise at ĀśvGS. 2, 10, 6; cf. also GGS. 3, 6, 2; KhGS. 3, 1, 45f.; HGS. 1, 18. Cf. S. R. Das, in Man in India (Ranchi) 33, p. 232.

outside the village after sunset or even after midnight and requiring the assistance of a brahmin[58]—and the *vṛṣotsarga* (the setting a bull at liberty on the full moon day of Kārttika).[59] The *sūtras* are silent on the purpose of the latter rite which is to benefit the deceased ancestors.

Of the numerous agricultural rites there are several of importance. The ceremony of ploughing, accomplished after the plough has been yoked, requires the cooking of a mess of sacrificial food *(sthālīpāka)*, sacrificing to Indra, the Maruts, Parjanya (Rain), Aśani (Lightning), Bhaga (Good Fortune), Sītā (Furrow) etc. These deities receive similar offerings at the furrow sacrifice, the threshing-floor sacrifice, the sowing and the reaping of the crop and at the putting of the crop into the barn. At molehills the king of moles should not be forgotten.[60] There are the offerings of the first-fruits *(āgrayaṇa)* that belong also to the *śrauta* ritual[61] and are part of the domestic manuals dealt with immediately after the *āśvayujī*, a milk-rice oblation offered to Indra and (or) Paśupati, Śiva, Rudra, the Aśvins on the full moon day of Āśvayuja.[62]

In addition to these special rites the *gṛhyasūtras* incorporate a number of sacrifices, ceremonies or ritual performances, some of them of a rather general character, others serving a more special purpose. The popular *bali* oblations which are not thrown into the domestic fire but offered on the floor or ground are to propitiate the gods of the regions of the universe, those of the *agnihotra*, the waters, herbs and trees, house and site and many other divine powers of a lower order; ŚGS. 2, 14, 6f.:

> "He then distributes *bali* offerings, from the left to the right, through the different quarters (of the sky, to their presiding deities) in due order (pronouncing the formulas): 'Adoration to Indra (in the east) and to those belonging to Indra. Adoration to Yama (in the south) and to those belonging to Yama . . ."[63]

The rite to be performed on the day of full moon in the month of Śrāvaṇa, a period which is dangerous because of the snakes, is in propitiation of these animals—the celestial, aerial and terrestrial ones—executed with *bali* oblations and otherwise.[64] The rites of the *āgrahāyaṇī*, to be performed on the day of full moon in Agrahāyaṇa, conclude the ceremonies relating to the serpents: the danger from these animals being over, the beds come back to the ground and

[58] For particulars see HILLEBRANDT, Rit., p. 83; cf. ĀśvGS. 4, 8; 1, 3, 6; PGS. 3, 8; HGS. 2, 8f. etc.

[59] See KANE, H. Dh. IV, p. 539; ŚGS. 3, 11; PGS. 3, 9; KāṭhGS. 59; KauṣGS. 3, 11 (3, 6).

[60] GGS. 4, 4, 27ff.; differently PGS. 2, 13; ŚGS. 4, 13; ĀśvGS. 2, 10, 3f. See also MEYER, Trilogie, III, p. 155; 157.

[61] ŚGS. 3, 8; ĀśvGS. 2, 2, 4f.; GGS. 3, 8, 9ff.; KhGS. 3, 3, 6ff.; PGS. 3, 1; MGS. 2, 3, 9ff. (called *navayajña*); ĀpGS. 7, 19, 6f.; VaikhGS. 4, 2. See KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 827.

[62] E.g. ŚGS. 4, 16; ĀśvGs. 2, 2, 1ff.; PGS. 2, 16; GGS. 3, 8, 1ff.

[63] See also BhGS. 3, 12ff.; ĀśvGS. 1, 2, 3ff.; GGS. 1, 4; ĀpGS. 3, 8, 4; MGS. 2, 12; VārGS. 17 (offered to all the gods, including the demons and the deceased); KāṭhGS. 54; KauśS. 74, 1ff., differing in length and particulars.

[64] ŚGS. 4, 15; ĀśvGS. 2, 1; PGS. 2, 14; KhGS. 3, 2, 1ff.; MGS. 2, 16 etc.

the house is thoroughly cleaned.[65] After the *āgrahāyaṇī* follow the three (or four) *aṣṭakā* festivals (on the eighth day after full moon) in the second fortnight of Mārgaśīrṣa and the following months, that is, in the winter-months.[66] Some authors say that the sacrificial substance is vegetables, flesh, and flour-cakes, according to the order of the *aṣṭakās*. As to the deities there was difference of opinion, ĀśvGS. 2, 4, 12:

> This *(aṣṭakā)* some stated to be sacred to the Viśve Devāḥ, some to Agni, some to the Sun, some to Prajāpati; some state that Night is its deity, some that the Constellations are, or the Seasons, or the Fathers, some that cattle is."

The *aṣṭakās* (or the middle one only) are followed by the elaborate *anvaṣṭakya* ritual which consists of offerings to Soma and the Fathers, to the Fathers in the east and their wives in the west, and other acts.[67] Requiring a sacrifice to the Fathers, the important *aṣṭakās* are closely related to the popular *śrāddhas*. *Śrāddhas*[68] are ceremonies prescribed for the Fathers on special occasions, such as the birth of a son, the giving of a name to the child, and marriage. Besides, there are regular monthly *śrāddhas*. The elements discussed in more than one *sūtra* are the invitation of the brahmins who, representing the Fathers, are to eat the balls of rice *(piṇḍa)*; the offering of the *piṇḍas*; the so-called *ekoddiṣṭa śrāddha*, meant for a single dead person; the reception of a deceased ancestor into the community of the *piṇḍa* offerings with the other Fathers; the *ābhyudayika*, i.e. the *śrāddha* ceremony referring to good luck.[69] A respectful reception[70] is not only—as already observed—due to a bridegroom (a *snātaka*, i.e. a young Aryan who has taken the ceremonial bath after finishing his study of the Veda), but also to the spiritual guide *(ācārya)*, an officiating priest, the father-in-law, a king, and a friend. This ritual, which requires the offering of meat to the guest, is sometimes intercalated in the marriage ceremonies,[71] elsewhere dealt with in connexion with the student's returning home.[72]

[65] BhGS. 2, 2; ŚGS. 4, 17 and 18; ĀśvGS. 2, 3; HGS. 2, 17; KāṭhGS. 60, 1; MGS. 2, 7 etc.; see DRESDEN's note, M. G. S., p. 132; M. WINTERNITZ, Der Sarpabali, Mitt. Anthrop. Ges. Wien 18 (1888), p. 25; 250.

[66] BhGS. 2, 15ff.; GGS. 3, 10; ŚGS. 3, 12ff.; PGS. 3, 3; ĀśvGS. 2, 4 (four *aṣṭakās*); MGS. 2, 8; KāṭhGS. 61ff.; JGS. 2, 3: VaikhSmS. 4, 3f.; see OLDENBERG, in WEBER, I. S. XV, p. 145; WINTERNITZ, in WZKM 4, p. 199; CALAND, Totenverehrung, p. 41; Ahnenkult, p. 166; HILLEBRANDT, Rit., p. 94; KEITH, R. Ph. V. U., p. 428.

[67] E.g. GGS. 4, 2; ŚGS. 3, 13, 7; ĀśvGS. 2, 5; for a curious variant see MGS. 2, 9.

[68] CALAND, Ahnenkult, p. 18 (see also the same, in WZKM 8, p. 288); WINTERNITZ, in WZKM 4, p. 199; KANE, H. Dh. IV, p. 334; DAKSHINA RANJAN SHASTRI, Origin and development of the rituals of ancestor worship in India, Calcutta 1963. A passing reference may be made to the existence of numerous later works on this subject, very often in *ślokas* and some of them numbering over a thousand or two thousand verses. The oldest of these works seem to belong to the Maithila school. See e.g. HARAPRASĀD SHĀSTRĪ, A descriptive catalogue of Sanskrit manuscripts in the Gov. Collection, III, Calcutta 1925, p. XL; 398.

[69] See ŚGS. 4, 1—4; ĀśvGS. 2, 5, 10ff.; 4, 7; cf. also BhGS. 2, 11—14.

[70] E.g. ŚGS. 2, 15—17; PGS. 1, 3; GGS. 4, 10.

[71] MGS. 1, 9; KāṭhGS. 24; VārGS. 11.

[72] HGS. 1, 12, 5ff.; JGS. 1, 19: 18, 12.

The compilers of these manuals were further often interested in a variety of other subjects. Expiations and atonements *(prāyaścitta)*—for instance, for irregularities in the domestic sacrifices—are frequently mentioned; rites for averting evil on different occasions, for neutralizing portents and for procuring success or for mounting a chariot, formulas to be pronounced at crossroads, rites to prevent friends from being estranged or servants from running away as well as oblations for the diseased are found in several *sūtras*, and so are the precautions and ritual obligations of those who set out on a journey.[73]

3. The mantras

The *mantras* which occur in the domestic manuals—including the citations drawn from *saṃhitās* and *brāhmaṇas* and all kinds of liturgical formulas such as *yajus*, summons *(praiṣa)*, non-hieratic verses *(gāthā)*[1] etc.—deserve a special discussion.[2] The tradition of these formulas—numbering far over a thousand[3]—is often very fluid, and many of them are liable to variation even to the point of showing almost all possible variants that the words constituting them are capable of.[4] Part of the variants may owe their form to more or less conscious adaptations to a new context: Vedic schools did not regard as unalterable the text of formulas which were foreign to their own *saṃhitā*.[5] Not infrequently *mantras* have been rearranged[6] or combined,[7] extended or curtailed.[8] Besides,

---

[73] See S. B. E. XXX, p. 306, and also MGS. 1, 3; KGS. 56; 72; BhGS. 2, 30ff.; VaikhSmS. 6 etc.

[1] Cf. Gonda, V. L., p. 88; 405. Oldenberg, in S. B. E. XXX, p. XIV.

[2] Cf. V. M. Apte, in NIA 3, p. 49.

[3] R. N. Dandekar, in ABORI 51, p. 271 takes "all the important *mantras* employed in the *gṛhya* rites" to be "nearly 1100"; P. K. Narayana Pillai, Non-ṛgvedic mantras in the marriage ceremonies, Trivandrum 1958, p. 1 makes mention of "approximately 2500" *mantras*. The collection contained in M. Bloomfield, A Vedic concordance, Cambridge Mass. 1906 is incomplete.

[4] See also Pillai, op. cit., p. 51; 53. Even in two editions of the same text the *mantras* may vary considerably; see e.g. C. G. Kashikar, in BDCRI 35 (1975), p. 67. Cases are however not lacking in which a formula occurs in the same form in several texts, e.g. ŚŚS. 4, 21, 3; ŚGS. 3, 7, 5; ĀśvGS. 1, 24, 20f.; PGS. 1, 3, 12 etc.

[5] Cf. V. M. Apte, in NIA 3, p. 49; Pillai, op. cit., e.g. p. 44; 202.

[6] Cf. also V. M. Apte, in NIA 3, p. 177.

[7] Cf. also R. N. Dandekar, in ABORI 51, p. 271; Pillai, op. cit., p. 81 speaks of concatenation. Cf. also ibidem, p. 51. Four of the six *pādas* ('quarters') of ĀgnGS. 1, 5, 5 are for instance found elsewhere, viz. at MS. 1, 3, 12; MB. 1, 13, 2; AVŚ. 3, 23, 3; ṚV. 10, 184, 3.

[8] One should not, with Pillai, op. cit., p. 81, generalize and consider all 'un-original productions' (i.e. *mantras* that do not occur in the ancient texts) artificial. Scholars have sometimes been too soon inclined to 'emend' the formulas.

it appears that compilers of the manuals could hardly resist the temptation to add improvised words to a pre-existent *mantra*.[9] The order in which the stanzas belonging to the same 'hymn' appear in the *sūtra* works often deviates from that found in the basic collections. Normally, these authors join the compilers of the *śrauta* manuals in quoting the stanzas and formulas[10] recorded in the earlier literature of their own school (or earlier in the *sūtra* itself) *pratīkena*. Complete hymns may be referred to by the name of their author.[11]

Domestic *mantras* are in a number of cases employed in different manuals in the same ceremony and the same context. Thus the formula

> "You have (it has) come to me with illustriousness (and) glory; unite me with milk and brilliance; make me dear to (my fellow-)creatures, (and) overlord of cattle"

occurs (with some variant readings) in several texts[12] to accompany the acceptance of the so-called *arghya* water by a guest. Or the same *mantra* is used in similar contexts. When ĀśvGS. 1, 18 stating that the ceremony of shaving the beard runs parallel with the tonsure of a child's head mentioned in the preceding section prescribes the same *mantras* with "hair" in the latter and "beard" in the former rite one can speak of a conscious modification *(ūha)*.[13] It has often been observed that there exists a certain parallelism between the marriage and initiation rites;[14] what the latter are for a boy, the former are for a girl. This explains the use of the same formula establishing an intimate relationship between husband and wife in the one case and between preceptor and pupil in the other.[15] The only difference is the occurrence of the name Prajāpati (the creator god) in the context of the marriage ceremonies, and of Bṛhaspati (the priest of the gods) in that of the initiation rites.

Many *mantras* however were regarded as utilizable in more than two dif-

---

[9] Cf. also APTE, in NIA 3, p. 105; PILLAI, op. cit., p. 81, overlooks the possibility of borrowing from sources that are lost to us.

[10] Not all actions are accompanied by special *mantras*; see e.g. HGS. 1, 3, 3 and Haradatta, on ĀpGS. 1, 2, 15; or *mantras* may have been used that are not recorded in our texts. Cf. also ĀśvGS. 1, 7, 2. *Mantras* may occur in successions, e.g. ĀgnGS. 2, 5, 1; 2, 2, 5; 2, 4, 6; PGS. 1, 16, 6.

[11] Thus, in ĀśvGS. 1, 13, 6 *prajāvat* and *jīvaputra* indicate ṚVKhila 2, 10 and 11; cf. also BD. 5, 92. Cf. e.g. also WINTERNITZ, op. cit., p. XL; SEHGAL, Ś. G. S., p. 37, and for particulars, ibidem, p. 14. In manuscripts and some editions there is in places some confusion with regard to the delimitation of *mantras* and injunctions and the identification of the former; for some particulars: SEHGAL, Ś. G. S. ed., p. 9.

[12] BGS. 1, 2, 27 (the guest is the bridegroom); MB. 2, 9, 12; 2, 10, 2; ĀpGS. 5, 13, 8 (the Veda student; *samāvartana* ceremony); HGS. 1, 13, 3; ĀgnGS. 1, 4, 1; 2, 6, 6 *(madhuparka)*; PGS. 1, 3, 15 (respectful reception of guests).

[13] Cf. V. M. APTE, in NIA 3, p. 145; 148.

[14] See e.g. PILLAI, op. cit., p. 79; J. GONDA, Change and continuity in Indian religion, The Hague 1965, p. 324.

[15] PGS. 1, 8, 8; MGS. 1, 10, 13: PGS. 2, 2, 16; MGS. 1, 22, 10. ĀśvGS. 1, 21, 7 and ŚGS. 2, 4, 1 prescribe the *mantra* on the occasion of the *upanayana*.

ferent contexts. The same formula may for instance appear in the section on the marriage rites in one manual, as an *upanayana mantra* in another, and in connexion with the *samāvartana* or *sīmantonnayana* ceremonies in a third or a fourth.[16] An example of a 'domestic formula' that was applicable under various circumstances is "Well-eyed may I become with my eyes . . ." which at ĀśvGS. 3, 6, 7 is prescribed for a person whose eye palpitates (etc.), at MGS. 1, 9, 25 for the bride who while putting on ornaments (amulets) touches the parts of her body mentioned in the formula, and at PGS. 2, 6, 19 for a person who is to salve himself. Whereas some authorities[17] use the *mantra* "Give length of life, O God (Agni) . . . *(āyur dā deva . . .)*" when in the *upanayana* ritual a piece of *palāśa* wood is placed on the fire, the words in the second half "lead this (boy) to old age" being appropriate to the occasion, VārGS. 3, 12 and 4, 15 has it recited during the *annaprāśana* (the first food given to a baby)[18] and the *cūḍā* ceremonies, BGS. 3, 7, 12 likewise appropriately prescribes it for the *āyuṣya* rite which is part of the birth ritual and ŚG. 1, 25, 7 uses it during the name-giving ceremony; others[19] enjoin its use at the time of offering one of the two chief libations from a ladle.

If a formula is of some length the wordings of its parts may make it suited for different rites. Thus the formula TĀ. 3, 2, 1 etc. referring to successful sacrificing as well as the creation of a desirable heaven for a sacrificer is in one and the same *sūtra* work prescribed for use after offering and for recitation over the face of a sacrificer who is about to die.[20]

Cases are not wanting in which the authors prescribe the recitation of different formulas for the same ritual. Thus, the putting of pieces of wood on the fire in the *upanayana* ritual[21] is in some manuals accompanied by "Thine is this fuel, Agni . . .",[22] in many others by "To Agni I have brought a piece of wood",[23] in others again by "Give length of life, O God".[24]

In spite of the importance attached to the liturgical suitability of the formulas there are a few[25] *mantras* that do not fit in well with the *gṛhya* context in which they occur or are in a definite context not sufficiently clear to us. This so-called inapplicability is in part of the cases no doubt due to their secondary character, for instance to their being transferred from a *śrauta* context.[26] Thus the words "Of the Vasus you . . ." which accompany in MGS.

[16] For particulars see also PILLAI, op. cit., p. 2; 69.

[17] BGS. 2, 5, 9; ĀpGS. 4, 10, 9 (ĀpMB. 2, 2, 1); cf. BhGS. 1, 8.

[18] Compare KGS. 39, 2.

[19] HGS. 1, 3, 5; cf. ĀgnGS. 1, 1, 2; but see HGS. 1, 6, 2.

[20] ĀgnGS. 1, 7, 1; 3, 4, 1.

[21] See KRISHNA LAL, in JOIB 17 (1967), p. 129.

[22] HGS. 1, 8, 4; ĀgnGS. 1, 1, 4 etc.

[23] ĀśvGS. 1, 21, 1; GGS. 2, 10, 46; PGS. 2, 4, 3 etc. ŚGS. 2, 10, 4 prescribes both *mantras*.

[24] BGS. 2, 5, 9; ĀpGS. 4, 10, 9.

[25] Otherwise, but incorrectly, e.g. WINTERNITZ, G. I. L., I, p. 236.

[26] Cf. also APTE, in Vol. C. Kunhan Raja, Adyar-Madras 1946, p. 235; PILLAI, op. cit., p. 45, and, e.g., cases such as MGS. 1, 18, 4.

2, 11, 13 the placing of a post in a pit are not clear. AVŚ. 2, 13 (to accompany the putting of a new garment on a child; invoking Agni) and 6, 41 (addressed to various divinities) have nothing to do with the tonsure ceremony to which Kauśika (53f.) applies them.[27] However, a 'metaphorical interpretation' may sometimes add to the comprehensibility of the relation between the *mantra* and its context. For instance, "I am the summit of those who are like me . . ." (or "the highest among my fellow-men") in the formula to be recited by a guest who sits down on the seat offered to him[28] gains in clearness when it is not taken literally.

Contrary to expectation the bonds between the *gṛhya* contexts and the *mantras* contained in them are on the whole closer, their connexions in many cases less vague than those between *śrauta* contexts and their formulas. The reasons of this difference may be the greater artificiality of many *śrauta* rites and the greater need for comprehensibility on the part of those who performed the domestic rites.

The contents of the *mantras* are normally related to one single ritual act; their links with the ceremony as such—if there are any—are implicit or deducible from the terminology used. In many cases the liturgical employment of *gṛhya mantras* is indeed not so arbitrary as has often been supposed[29] but appears to be governed by one of the following principles.[30]

Very often their function is 'sacramental' or consecratory. For instance those ṛgvedic stanzas which in Āśvalāyana and Śāṅkhāyana have been borrowed from the Saṃhitā occur in the same sacramental setting or context as in that basic collection itself. Compare, not only the passages referring to the marriage and funeral texts but also cases such as Āśv. 2, 6, 12 enjoining upon the man who ceremoniously drives a new chariot to look, before descending, at the sun while murmuring ṚV. 4, 31, 15 "Make, O Sūrya, our renown the highest . . .".[31]

Oblations to, or into, the domestic fire may be accompanied by *mantras* which, emphasizing Agni's function as the messenger who conveys the oblations to the gods (ṚV. 1, 12, 1f. quoted at ĀśvGS. 1, 11, 2), his purificatory activity (ṚV. 9, 66, 19–21 at ĀśvGS. 1, 4, 4) etc. may be called oblational formulas. Part of these are short: "To Agni, *svāhā*".[32]

---

[27] Cf. WEBER, I. S. XIII, p. 171; W. D. WHITNEY and CH. R. LANMAN, Atharva-Veda Saṃhitā, Cambridge Mass. 1905, p. 56.

[28] ŚŚS. 4, 21, 2; ĀśvGS. 1, 24, 8; MG. 1, 9, 8 etc. Compare also cases such as PGS. 1, 4, 12; VārGS. 13, 4 (mistranslated by PILLAI, op. cit., p. 146).

[29] See e.g. E. W. FAY, The Rig-Veda mantras in the Gṛhya Sūtras, Thesis J. Hopkins Univ., Roanoke 1899, p. 14 and compare CALAND, Zauberritual, p. VIII and RENOU, in JA 236, p. 132.

[30] For particulars see V. M. APTE, in BDCRI 1, p. 14; 127. I leave justificatory citations such as ĀśvGS. 1, 1, 3 out of account.

[31] See e.g. also ṚV. 2, 42: ĀśvGS. 3, 10, 9; 4, 57: ĀśvGS. 2, 10, 4; 6, 28: ŚGS. 3, 9, 3; 7, 54: ĀśvGS. 2, 9, 9; 10, 161: ĀśvGS. 3, 6, 4.

[32] E.g. MGS. 1, 4, 3; 2, 2, 18; 22; 2, 3, 1; 2, 4, 6; PGS. 1, 12, 3.

Not infrequently these formulas, while briefly describing the act which they are to accompany, formulate at the same time the significance of the act and (or) the result the performer desires to attain. For instance, in a section on the taking of the sacred fire into one's own person it reads ĀgnGS. 1, 5, 1:

> "I take into myself first Agni, for the increase of wealth, for good progeny, for energetic sons. I put in myself progeny, illustriousness. May we be uninjured in our bodies (and) rich in energetic sons".[33]

A good instance of a new or special *mantra* ingeniously formed to "co-ordinate a specific and popular *gṛhya* act with the mythological background provided by the *brāhmaṇas*"[34] occurs in SMB. 1, 1, 2; GGS. 2, 1, 10. When the bride is washed with *surā* (a sort of beer) the following formula is pronounced:

> "O Kāma, I know thy name. Intoxication thou art by name. Do thou bring him (the bridegroom) together (with her). To thee there was *surā*. Here (may there be thy) excellent birth. O Agni, thou art created from penance, hail! *(svāhā)*".

Intoxicating liquor being believed to cause sexual excitement[35] Kāma, that is Passion, is identified with Surā and with the god of the domestic fire, Agni, whom Prajāpati had produced by means of *tapas* (ŚB. 2, 2, 4, 1). When the bride is sprinkled with water the recitation of the stanza ṚV. 8, 91, 8 is to reactivate the wholesome and purificatory power inherent in the Apālā hymn.[36]

Occasionally a 'domestic *mantra*' is a benediction that, though obviously prescribed in a stereotyped form, does not essentially differ from formulas expressing good wishes etc. as are usual in other countries; e.g. ĀśvGS. 3, 6, 7:

> "When he has sneezed, yawned . . ., when his eye palpitates, and when he hears noises in his ears, he should murmur, 'Well-eyed may I become with my eye . . ., well-hearing with my ears . . .'"

Not a few *mantras* can be described as prayers.[37] Thus for a person who wishes to recover the faculty of sight MGS. 1, 4, 16 prescribes the formula addressed to the Sun:

> "Give an eye to our eye, an eye to ourselves to see; may we behold and distinguish this (earth)".

These prayers may quite naturally combine with praise; MGS. 2, 14, 31:

> "Glory be to thee, O adorable one, thou that possessest a hundred beams, that dispersest darkness; do thou, O god, destroy my misfortune, (and) unite me with happiness".

---

[33] Cf. e.g. also BGS. 1, 2, 34; 36; 44; MGS. 1, 4, 16 II; 1, 9, 24; 1, 17, 5; 1, 22, 7; 2, 2, 25; ĀśvGS. 1, 24, 29; HGS. 1, 13, 13; 2, 2, 5. Hence also the indication "(he does as) said in the *mantra*" (e.g. Kauś. 43, 9).

[34] Pillai, op. cit., p. 94.

[35] See e.g. J. J. Meyer, Trilogie altindischer Mächte und Feste der Vegetation, Zürich and Leipzig 1937, II, p. 111; III, p. 184.

[36] MGS. 1, 8, 11; see Gonda, V. L., p. 145. Other instances: MGS. 1, 10, 15; 2, 14, 26; PGS. 1, 7, 3.

[37] See e.g. MGS. 1, 1, 23f.; 1, 3, 1f.; 1, 5, 6 I; 1, 16, 2.

Praise may end in a ritual application (AVŚ. 3, 13, 7). Invocations—e.g. MGS. 1, 2, 2 "Come hither, you pure goddess, O word . . ."—homage or adoration—e.g. VGS. 15, 7 "Homage to Rudra who stays at a burning ground"—are of course not absent.

The texts make also mention of *mantras* for preventing misfortune, averting evil, blessing or expiation: ĀśvGS. 4, 6, 18:[38]

> "After sunrise, having murmured the hymns sacred to the sun *(sauryāṇi)* and the auspicious hymns *(svastyayanāni)* . . ., having offered oblation with (the eight stanzas of) ṚV. 1, 97[39] stanza by stanza . . ., he should cause brahmins to pronounce auspicious words *(svastyayanaṃ vācayitvā)*".

When a bridal procession approaches a place where dead bodies are burnt the following *mantra* is prescribed in KāṭhGS. 26, 8:

> "The evil spirits connected with the corpses that lie in those burning grounds must enjoy there; don't look at brides".

In other cases however an individual god is addressed for similar reasons. Thus Rudra—the god who, though causing misfortune, is believed to relent if he is duly worshipped—is at MGS. 1, 13, 10 praised with ṚV. 1, 114, a Rudra hymn which at ŚGS. 5, 6, 2 is prescribed in case a person has become ill and, with ṚV. 1, 43; 2, 33; 7, 46, pronounced to worship the same god during the *śūlagava* rite which is performed in his honour. It is clear that this hymn was believed to be especially suited for affecting the thought or action of Rudra.[40]

In a number of cases—but not so often as has been assumed—a *mantra* has been chosen because the act which it is to accompany may have reminded the teachers or performers of one of the words or phrases occurring in it. Thus when one should board a ship (ĀśvGS. 2, 6, 8) the stanza ṚV. 10, 63, 10 is prescribed; addressed to the Earth, Heaven and Aditi it expresses the wish "may we go aboard the divine ship . . .". In no early text this stanza with the metaphor of a ship is used in the context of a journey.[41] AVŚ. 13, 1, 1 addressing the sun "Rise up, O bearer of creative power, that (art) within the waters" is at Kauś. 49, 18 pronounced over a sinking boat. In a case such as AVŚ. 2, 31 the healing rite against worms as suggested by the *sūkta* deviates considerably from the procedure described in the *sūtra* text (Kauś. 27, 14ff.).

---

[38] Cf. also ĀśvGS. 2, 3, 13; 3, 9, 2 (ṚV. 10, 128).

[39] = AVŚ. 4, 33, called the *apāghaṃ* ("away the evil") *sūkta* at Kauśika-Sūtra 42, 22.

[40] Apte, in BDCRI 1, p. 17 speaks of 'mythological citations'.

[41] The mention of the goddess Ghṛtapadī (Iḍā whose foot drops with ghee) in VārGS. 13, 2 shows that the *mantra* was considered suited for its purpose: it is to accompany the rubbing of the bride's face with the remnants of the sacrificial butter. See, e.g., also MP. 1, 2, 1ff.; ĀpGS. 2, 4, 8 (Pillai, op. cit., p. 153); Pillai, op. cit., p. 177 (no. 131); KauśS. 9, 9: AVŚ. 16, 1, 1; KauśS. 49, 1: AVŚ. 9, 2, 1; MGS. 1, 2, 16. According to commentators *mantras* may be used on the strength of a name *(samākhya)* or characteristic element *(liṅga)* occurring in them. See e.g. BGS. 1, 1, 17; 1, 6, 24 (TB. 2, 4, 6, 5—7); Kauś. 28, 13.

Kauśika-Sūtra 26, 41—27, 4 may be mentioned as an instance of a complex of ritual acts that are at least in part adapted to the words of the text prescribed, in casu AVŚ. 2, 8, quoted serially.

Some words must be inserted here on occasional questions-and-answers of the *brahmodya* type,[42] short dialogues of a fixed form which, while solving a problem or leading to the correct answer, were to elicit success. For instance, in an agricultural rite a farmer who is ploughing ritually and his wife have to hold the following conversation, Kauś. 20, 16ff.:

> "Have you ploughed?" / "We have ploughed". / "What have you ploughed (attracted, another meaning of the verb)?" / "Property, well-being, prosperity, progeny, cattle, food . . ."

There exist also fixed modes of address, which, being foreign to the *mantra* collections extant, are to accompany definite ritual acts; for instance

> "Thou very auspicious one (that art) rich in progeny . . . (may I, the master of your house live)".[43]

Rather than on the ancient *saṃhitās* and *brāhmaṇas* the domestic rites and *mantras* are generally speaking based on a tradition of their own and on autonomous collections which are not identical with the four well-known *saṃhitās*.[44] Relations with these basic works are of course not lacking but in many cases limited to stray citations and the occurrence of formulas that may or may not be the result of direct or indirect borrowing, the ṛgvedic *sūtras* drawing, for instance, from the Ṛgveda-Saṃhitā. Or, to express myself otherwise, the *gṛhya* formulas are in all probability based on collections which maintain various, more or less close, occasional or secondary, relations with the *śrauta* tradition.[45] That means that the domestic books, to mention only this, incorporate many non-ṛgvedic and non-yajurvedic mantras.[46] For instance, in the sections on the marriage rites no less than 425 non-ṛgvedic formulas make their appearance[47]— not only in the non-ṛgvedic *sūtras*, but also in those that claim to belong to the Ṛgveda-Saṃhitā[48]—and that notwithstanding the fact

[42] Cf. GONDA, V. L., p. 132; 134; 353; 382. See also Kauś. 17, 6f.; 27, 21; 50, 15f.

[43] Kauś. 24, 13; (39, 9; 76, 23).

[44] I refer to GONDA, V. L., p. 30.

[45] See for instance also KNAUER, GGS. II, p. 52; WINTERNITZ, The Mantrapāṭha (see n. 102 below), p. XL; RENOU, Écoles, p. 42.

[46] A systematic study of this material has long been neglected, although Winternitz (op. cit.), Caland and others paid some attention to it. For observations on the metrical character of the *mantras* in connexion with their age see OLDENBERG, in S. B. E. XXX, p. XI; XXXV.

[47] PILLAI, op. cit., p. 2.

[48] E.g. ĀśvGS. 1, 7, 6; ŚGS. 1, 13, 4 (PILLAI, op. cit., p. 213); ĀśvGS. 2, 4, 17; ŚGS. 1, 13, 11 (PILLAI, p. 219); ĀśvGS. 1, 7, 7 (PILLAI, p. 220); ŚGS. 1, 14, 1 (PILLAI, p. 227). See also V. M. APTE, Non-ṛgvedic *mantras* rubricated in the Āśvalāyana-Gṛhyasūtra. Their sources and interpretation, NIA 3 (1940—41), p. 49; 101; 144; 171; 211; 235; and APTE, The Ṛgveda mantras in their ritual setting in the gṛhya-sūtras, BDCRI 1 (1939—40), p. 14; 127.

that that Saṃhitā comprises a collection of wedding-stanzas (10, 85) which was well known to Āśvalāyana and Śāṅkhāyana. A considerable part of these *mantras* do occur in other basic texts—for instance the Atharvaveda-Saṃhitā, the Taittirīya texts and even the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa[49]—but we should guard against the hasty conclusion that these works have always been the direct sources of the *sūtrakāras*.[50] On the contrary, it is in many cases impossible exactly to trace the source of a particular *mantra*.[51] Many other formulas contained in the domestic books cannot be found in the older literature.[52]

In the period antecedent to the production of the *gṛhyasūtras* there must have existed a more or less common stock of formulas, a floating mass of stanzas, half-stanzas, etc., of variable form and application and for the greater part handed down orally, which was drawn upon by the *sūtrakāras* as their particular circumstances and undertakings might require.[53] In doing so they probably adopted many formulas which in their particular school were traditionally connected with definite ritual acts—how many it is absolutely impossible to say—, and saw to a certain extent to it that the formulas in the manuals which they produced were suited to the particular contexts. It is beyond doubt that in arranging their material they systematically quoted those *mantras* which were already found in works of their own school *pratīkena* and highly probable that they consciously transferred *mantras* from *śrauta* rites if the *gṛhya* tradition failed to supply suitable formulas.[54] Anyhow, taking the unavoidable variations in the different Vedic schools[55] into consideration we find that a fairly comprehensive quantity of domestic formulas is common to nearly all the extant *gṛhyasūtras*. These *mantras* may be broadly divided into two classes. The first class consists of formulas of a more general—or in any case non-domestic—character. Belonging to the pre-*gṛhya* strata of the Vedic literature they can also be found in *śrauta* rites. Since this group comprises formulas of different origin it is an acceptable supposition that for instance part of the *mantras* which the *sūtrakāras* belonging to ṛgvedic schools have in

---

[49] See e.g. Caland, JGS. ed., p. XI.

[50] Apte, Non-ṛgvedic mantras, is too much inclined to take this relation for granted; see also Krishna Lal, Mantras employed in the *gṛhyasūtras* for placing the fuel sticks in the fire in the *upanayana* ritual, JOIB 17, p. 129.

[51] In this respect Pillai, op. cit., p. 69 is too optimistic.

[52] E.g. ĀśvGS. 1, 5, 4 (wedding) "Ṛta has been born first, in the beginning. On *ṛta* reality (truth, *satyam*) is founded. Let this girl attain here that (destiny) for which she has been born"; ŚGS. 2, 6, 1; 6, 5, 1; MGS. 1, 12, 3; 4; HGS. 1, 23, 1; GGS. 4, 5, 3.

[53] This hypothesis is in harmony with PGS. 1, 8, 11 "What (people in) the village tell them, that they should do".

[54] See below and compare also Pillai, op. cit., p. 5.

[55] It may be remembered that cases are not rare in which no two *manuals* are alike in the treatment of details. Many *mantras* found in the Mantra-Brāhmaṇa (see below) occur also in the Jaimini-Gṛhyasūtra, but never wholly identical. It should not, with Pillai, op. cit., p. 13, be suggested that all variations are due to attempts to adapt the *mantras* to their new (domestic) environments.

common with the other schools were borrowed from this floating mass of formulas.[56] The second class of *mantras* consists of those which are suitable for, or have been adapted to, *gṛhya* contexts.[57] Beside the many formulas that do not occur outside the domestic manuals there are others which are found already in earlier literature in domestic or popular contexts.[58]

In explanation of the fact that a considerable part of the entire domestic *mantra* material cannot be traced in the pre-*gṛhya* literature it has been suggested[59] that it attests to the existence of a 'ritual' recension of the Ṛgveda, differing from the Saṃhitā extant, and completely lost to us. However, a much more plausible supposition would be that already at a comparatively early moment the several schools came to collect those *mantras* which were regularly used by those who performed their domestic rites, efforts that may have resulted in *mantrapāṭha* collections some of which have been preserved.[60] A passing reference may in this connexion be made to the very frequent *gṛhya mantras* which in the Kauśika-Sūtra are not derived from the Atharva-Saṃhitā and therefore given in their complete form:[61] did they belong to a more or less fixed or 'received' parallel collection? It seems even warranted to suppose that there have existed *mantra* collections *(saṃhitā)* of smaller compass for the use of those who had to execute one of the important domestic rituals.[62] The section 1, 5 of the Āgniveśya-Gṛhyasūtra is indeed such a collection; preceding the rules for the marriage ritual (1, 6) it serves as a kind

[56] However, we shall never know precisely to what extent "eclectic considerations competed successfully with loyalty to one's own *śākhā*" (Apte, in Volume C. Kunhan Raja, Adyar-Madras 1946, p. 237).

[57] According to Pillai, op. cit., p. 41 the number of non-ṛgvedic wedding-*mantras* "that betray a definite *gṛhya* bias" is about 275.

[58] E.g. ṚV. 10, 155, 5 "These have led round the cow" (which is part of an exorcism), also VS. 35, 18 (cf. AVŚ. 6, 28, 2) occurs at ĀśvGS. 4, 6, 14 in an expiatory rite during which a tawny-coloured bull is led round. Oldenberg (in S. B. E. XXX, p. X) was no doubt right in surmising that a portion of "these verses and songs proves to have been composed . . . for the very *gṛhya* ceremonies for which they are prescribed in the texts of the ritual" but not in adding that it was not before "the latter part of the Ṛgveda period (that) ceremonies such as marriage and burial began to be decked out with poetry" (if by this term he means the *gṛhya mantras*). See ṚV. 2, 42 (ĀśvGS. 3, 10, 9); 4, 57 (ĀśvGS. 2, 10, 4); 6, 28 (ŚGS. 3, 9, 3); 7, 54 (ĀśvGS. 2, 9, 9); 10, 161 (ĀśvGS. 3, 6, 4) etc. and compare also Gopal, I. V. K., p. 14.

[59] A. Hillebrandt, in: Spuren einer älteren Ṛgveda-Recension, Bezzenberger's Beiträge 8, p. 195; ZDMG 40, p. 708; GGA 1889, p. 418; E. W. Fay, The treatment of Vedic mantras in the gṛhyasūtras, J. Hopkins Univ. Circular, 9, 81 (1890), p.74; J. Scheftelowitz, Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda, Breslau 1906, p. 7; combatted by H. Oldenberg, Die Hymnen des Ṛgveda, I Prolegomena, Berlin 1888, p. 518; V. M. Apte, in BDCRI 1, p. 141; see also Oldenberg, in GGA 1907, p. 218; P. Sabbathier, in Revue d'histoire des religions 20, p. 330; Renou, in JA 236, p. 133 and Écoles, p. 5.

[60] See below.

[61] See Bloomfield, Kauśika Sūtra, ed., p. XXIX; 386.

[62] Cf. also Renou, in JA 248, p. 274.

of *mantrapāṭha* to it, although it must be admitted that the correspondence between both sections is not complete.[63] AVŚ. XIX—a regrouping of material found in the Paippalāda recension—being in the Kauśika-Sūtra sometimes quoted *pratīkena*, but more often in full seems to have impressed the *sūtrakāra* as something between a body of *mantras* hailing from a different school and a separate group of additional *mantras* belonging to his own school.[64]

Dwelling for a moment upon the relations between the *mantras* in the domestic manuals and the early literature, it should be emphasized that the above is not to argue that the authoritative Saṃhitā of the Ṛgveda, the Atharvaveda —or rather the 'atharvanic sphere'—and other ancient collections did not exert influence on these formulas. There is no doubt that attempts to harmonize the outward form or the length or order of *mantras* with their counterparts in the Ṛgveda-Saṃhitā were often successful.[65] Ṛgvedic *gṛhya-sūtras* contain a few ritual details together with the accompanying *mantras* which belong to, and are characteristic of, schools of the Yajurveda: it seems warranted to suppose that the brahmins to whom we owe the *sūtras* could have borrowed them through the intermediary of *adhvaryu* priests with whom they officiated at *śrauta* rites.[66] Without entering into a discussion of the vexed question as to which and how many ṛgvedic stanzas had a genuinely ritual origin, that is, were or could be ritually employed from the beginning, it may be recalled that there is much to be said for the hypothesis that most of the formulas of ṚV. 10, 85 (the Sūryāsūkta; cf. AVŚ. XIV) that appear also in the domestic manuals formed part of that text from the very beginning[67] and that certain *mantras* which are common to the Saṃhitā and *gṛhyasūtras* were already in ṛgvedic times ritually used.[68]

There is no doubt whatever that the words

> "Agni, the killer of demons, must in harmony with Brahman, drive away from here the disreputable one, the disease(-demon) who rests on your embryo, your womb etc."

used at ŚGS. 1, 21, 2 in the ceremony for the protection of an embryo are suited for this purpose. Being intended to protect the foetus and to prevent miscarriage[69] they form also part of a series of stanzas to be pronounced by a

[63] For instance *mantras* found in 5 are absent in 6 and vice versa; for particulars see N. Tsuji, in Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko 19, Tokyo 1960, p. 47.

[64] Cf. also Bloomfield, Kauśika Sūtra, ed., p. XL.

[65] Cf. also Fay, l. cit. There are interesting differences in faithfulness or conformability. Thus Hiraṇyakeśin's Gṛhyasūtra contains more variants in the quotation from ṚV. 10th *maṇḍala* than Pāraskara's.

[66] I refer to Pillai, op. cit., p. 26 and p. 111 on ŚGS. 1, 8, 21.

[67] J. Ehni, in ZDMG 33, p. 166; R. Pischel (and K. Geldner), Vedische Studien, I, Stuttgart 1889, p. 14; Oldenberg, in GGA 1880, p. 7; Gonda, V. L., p. 115 and see A. Weber, Vedische Hochzeitssprüche, I. S. V, p. 177.

[68] See above, n. 58 and, e.g., ṚV. 10, 161, 1; 4 (AVŚ. 3, 11, 1; 4) mentioning a sacrifice.

[69] See J. Gonda, The Ṛgvidhāna, Utrecht 1951, p. 113.

person who longs for sons in the rite mentioned in MGS. 2, 18, 1ff. and occur also in the Ṛgvidhāna (4, 17, 1ff.)—which is not a *gṛhya* text—for the use of a woman "whose embryo might come to naught". Since the words constitute an exorcism of six stanzas directed against the demon of miscarriage and as such appear in the Ṛgveda as 10, 162 and the ritual acts consecrated by it in the above texts are very simple and uncomplicated—sacrificing six oblations from a mess of cooked food in ŚGS.—there is much to be said for the supposition, first that the compilers of ṚV. X were acquainted with a similar ritual application and in the second place that the authors of the *gṛhyasūtras* incorporated the *mantras* together with corresponding acts into their systematic treatment of the pregnancy rites.[70]

However, many ṛgvedic texts could not escape the influence of the employment of these formulas in the liturgical *saṃhitās* of the other Vedas, the *brāhmaṇas* and *śrautasūtras*.[71] These *mantras* are not confined to the marriage and funeral hymns or late components of the older literature.

As to the Atharvaveda-Saṃhitā it is a fact that it contains hymns and stanzas which do not only deal with domestic matter but are also found again in the literature under discussion.[72] Moreover, 'sorcery' being often bound up with popular ritual,[73] the atharvanic texts frequently coincide with the large quantity of formulas occurring in the ritual manuals that pray for the fulfilment of various wishes, such as offspring, cattle, continuance of life and so on. The conclusion is not too hazardous that these passages constitute collections of 'domestic material' drawn from the floating mass of formulas the existence of which has been assumed in the preceding part of this section.[74] Since, in a considerable number of cases the Atharvaveda explicitly refers to oblations *(havis)* accompanying the recitation of some of its texts[75] it seems likely that these 'domestic' formulas were ritually employed at a comparatively early

[70] Cf. also KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 221.

[71] See GONDA, V. L., p. 326; 328; APTE, in BDCRI I, p. 15; 52. Cf. e.g. the formula *savitus tvā prasava ut punāmy* . . . VS. 1, 31; ŚB. 1, 3, 1, 23; ĀśvGS. 1, 3, 3; ŚGS. 1, 8, 21.

[72] See e.g. AVŚ. 5, 25 for successful conception (Kauśika-Sūtra 35, 5ff.): cf. MP. 1, 12, 1ff.; HGS. 1, 25; ŚGS. 1, 19, 5f.; 6, 68 accompanying the act of shaving (Kauś. 53, 17ff. in the *godāna* ceremony): MB. 1, 6, 1f.; ĀśvGS. 1, 17, 6; 7; 10; PGS. 2, 1, 6; 11; GGS. 2, 9, 10f. etc.; 3, 12 accompanying the building of a house: HGS. 1, 27; PGS. 3, 4; MGS. 2, 11, 12ff. etc.; compare e.g. also 1, 11 for successful childbirth (Kauś. 33, 1ff.) and see KNAUER, in DLZ 1893, p. 362; OLDENBERG, in S. B. E. XXX, p. X; GONDA, V. L., p. 280ff.

[73] According to BGPS. 2, 6, 1f. all sacrificial ceremonies that are not performed with the three *śrauta* fires are domestic rites; these include also rites for purification, appeasement, welfare or malevolent purposes.

[74] Compare the observations made by BLOOMFIELD, Kauśika Sūtra, ed., p. XL and his conclusion: "We may assume that the materials of AVŚ. XIX were known in the tradition of all the Atharvan schools, that they were left out during a first diaskeuasis, but were afterwards thought worthy of being collected and added".

[75] For particula s see M. BLOOMFIELD, The Atharva-Veda and the Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa, Strassburg 1899, p. 93.

date. However, when in one or more *gṛhyasūtras* a *mantra* occurs in a form that is identical with, or similar to, its atharvanic variant scholars have often been too prone to jump to the conclusion that the *sūtrakāra* wrote the passage concerned under the influence of the Atharvaveda-Saṃhitā.[76] There is, in my opinion, no reason whatever to exclude the possibility of what might be called parallel borrowing: in a number of cases redactors of the Atharvaveda and compilers of ritual manuals may have chosen the same *mantras* or the same variants.[77] Nevertheless, there are coincidences that can hardly be ascribed to mere chance. Whereas in a rite for the benefit of a householder's cattle Āśvalāyana (2, 10, 7) and Śāṅkhāyana (3, 9, 3) prescribe the use of ṚV. 6, 28 which has eight stanzas,[78] the third ṛgvedic manual (KauṣGS. 3, 5, 6) mentions a text consisting of seven stanzas. This deviation may in fact be due to influence of the parallel version AVŚ. 4, 21 which has the smaller number of verses.[79]

A complicated problem which is in need of a close investigation concerns those *mantras* that occur in *gṛhya* as well as *śrauta* contexts. In part of the cases this 'double function' is easily explicable on account of identity or similarity of the situations. For instance, a guest has in *śrauta* as well as *gṛhya* contexts to let a cow free with "Let her drink water; let her eat grass; let her be allowed to roam at liberty" or part of these words.[80] The formula "O house, do not fear, do not tremble" pronounced by a sacrificer on approaching his house could quite naturally be used by any householder on returning from a journey.[81] The problem is however how to judge, in every single case, the

[76] See e.g. BLOOMFIELD, op. cit., p. 44; V. M. APTE, in NIA 3, p. 49; 58 (on ĀśvGS. 1, 7, 13 and AVŚ. 14, 1, 17; 19; 18); in NIA 3, p. 144 ("AVŚ. 6, 68, 2 is the source of the *mantra* in ĀśvGS. 1, 17, 1"); in NIA 3, p. 215 (on ĀśvGS. 2, 8, 16 and AVŚ. 3, 12, 2; 6f.); R. N. DANDEKAR, in ABORI 51, p. 271: "Broadly speaking the *gṛhyasūtras* derive their *mantras* from the *saṃhitās* of their own Vedic schools, not infrequently also from other *saṃhitās*, in most cases the Atharvaveda"; SEHGAL, Ś. G. S., p. 12f.; 54 "all the three (ṛgvedic) *gṛhyasūtras* contain a number of AV. verses as opposed to their own ṚV. schools"; B. C. LELE, Some atharvanic portions in the *gṛhyasūtras*, Thesis Bonn 1927, p. 13 goes so far as to contend that the fact that no two domestic manuals are alike in the treatment of a definite rite for the benefit of an unborn child may perhaps be due to their having borrowed the rite together with the *mantras* from outside, i.e. from the Atharvaveda (*in casu* Kauś. 35), the authors who incorporated these having "no definite knowledge either of the exact details of the rite or of the *mantras*".

[77] Cf. e.g. AVŚ. 6, 11, 2f.; ŚGS. 1, 19, 6 IIIf.

[78] Haradatta on ĀśvGS. comments upon all eight stanzas of the hymn.

[79] These *mantras* are discussed by SEHGAL, op. cit., p. 12 in elucidation of the influence of the Atharvaveda, but in the course of his argument he—cautiously, inadvertently, or for the sake of variation?—speaks of "a closer affinity" and of "the influence of folklore which is enshrined in the Atharvaveda". For the *mantras* connected with the rite for securing conception see LELE, op. cit., p. 16.

[80] See ŚŚ. 4, 21, 24; LŚS. 1, 2, 13; BGS. 1, 2, 50; MGS. 1, 9, 23 etc. (the bridegroom-guest); ĀpGS. 5, 13, 17 *(samāvartana)*; HGS. 1, 13, 12; cf. PILLAI, op. cit., p. 140. For lists of "common ritual items and similar contexts in *śrauta* and *gṛhya* ceremonies" see PILLAI, op. cit., p. 25; 28.

[81] ĀpŚS. 6, 27, 3; LŚS. 3, 3, 1 (cf. VS. 3, 41); ŚGS. 3, 7, 2; HGS. 1, 29, 1. Passages

'double function'. On the one hand, the probabilities are in favour of the supposition that in formulating their views of those rites and acts which both rituals have in common the compilers of the domestic manuals borrowed part of their *mantras* from the *śrauta* ritual with which they were thoroughly acquainted.[82] That means that this similarity is to a considerable extent, but not exclusively, due to the influence of the solemn ceremonies on the domestic rites as they are found in the manuals extant.[83] Thus the formula ĀśvGS. 1, 10, 23:

> "What I have done too much in this ceremony, or what I have done here too little, all that must Agni Sviṣṭakṛt[84] knowing (it) make well sacrificed and well offered for me",

accompanying the oblations of cooked food on the days of full and new moon has been regarded as "influenced by" ĀpŚS. 3, 12, 1.[85] There is on the other hand no denying that some rites—for instance the 'mixture of honey' (*madhuparka*, the respectful offering made to a guest)—are so essential to both contexts that it is not possible to determine their original character—whether *śrauta* or *gṛhya*.[86] There is moreover no reason whatever why certain acts together with their *mantras* should not have been 'domestic' in origin[87]—thus the seven *mantras* accompanying the six footsteps in ĀpŚS. 10, 22, 12f.[88]—or have belonged to a more or less undefined mass of 'popular' customs. Does the fact that the formula "O axe, do no harm to him" occurs in *saṃhitās* and in the ritual shaving of the sacrificer[89] necessarily prove that its use in the domestic tonsure and shaving rites is due to borrowing from the *śrauta* context? Moreover, a *mantra* may be applicable in so many situations that its 'original use' cannot be determined.[90] The invocation of Aditi who is described

---

in domestic works that have been transferred from *śrauta* manuals (e.g. BGPS. 1, 8, 21f.) can be left out of account.

[82] E.g. ĀśvGS. 1, 14, 3 is *pratīkena* quoted from ĀśvŚS. 6, 14, 16. Cf. Renou, in JA 236, p. 133; Pillai, op. cit., p. 30. Apte (in BDCRI 1, p. 127) however was inclined to consider the *mantras* connected with agriculture, cattle-breeding, divination etc. to be exclusively or originally intended for *gṛhya* rites.

[83] See Caland, Over de 'wenschoffers', Amsterdam Acad. 1902, p. 29 on the part played in this process by those brahmins who, being conversant with the *śrauta* ritual, officiated at *gṛhya* ceremonies.

[84] The epithet indicates this function of the god.

[85] Apte, in NIA 3, p. 102.

[86] Compare also Pillai, op. cit., p. 27; 131, and Caland, in GGA 1897, p. 285.

[87] Gārgya Nārāyaṇa on ĀśvŚS. 1, 1, 4 observes that if *śrautasūtras* speak of rinsing the mouth etc. it is only done in order to show that such customs, though belonging to the province of the *gṛhya* rites, are acknowledged by the *śrauta* manuals.

[88] See Caland, on ĀpŚS. 10, 23, 1.

[89] TS. 1, 2, 1, 1; VS. 4, 1 etc.; cf. Caland and Henry, L'agniṣṭoma, p. 11. For the *mantra* and "Herb protect him" (ĀśvGS. 1, 17, 8; ŚGS. 1, 28, 12; ĀpŚS. 7, 2, 4; 7, 18, 12: immolation of an animal, etc.) see also Apte, in NIA 3, p. 145.

[90] For a list of "dissimilar contexts in *śrauta* and *gṛhya* ceremonies accompanied by the same *mantras*" see Pillai, op. cit., p. 35. One should not however follow this

as protecting and conducting well (AVŚ. 7, 6, 2) is quite intelligibly prescribed, not only when sacrifices are offered to that goddess but also in rites for welfare or protection.[91] If the above *mantra* ĀśvGS. 1, 10, 23 was borrowed from the *śrauta* ritual its various applications in Hiraṇyakeśin's domestic manual[92] must be secondary; if the latter authority has preserved a more general use, Āpastamba may have reduced its applicability to a single *śrauta* occasion. Even if a ritual act has been clearly modelled on a *śrauta* rite—for instance, the walking of the bridal couple over a layer of *ulapa* grass which is to establish a connexion between the chariot in which they arrive and their house (MGS. 1, 14, 4f.)[93]—the accompanying *mantra* is sometimes found to have come from elsewhere, in casu from the above ceremonious approaching of one's dwelling.[94]

Deviating from the more usual practice as adopted by Śāṅkhāyana, Pāraskara and others some *gṛhyasūtras* are peculiar in that they merely state the ritual acts, but refer for the *mantras* to separate collections the existence of which they presuppose. Thus the Gobhila-Gṛhyasūtra is, as far as its formulas are concerned, for the greater part based on the Mantra-Brāhmaṇa,[95] which tradition does not ascribe to the author of the *sūtra*. The fact that this collection—of unknown date—is strictly limited to the domestic ritual[96] explains, on the one hand the at first sight curious presence of only four sāmavedic *mantras* in a total of 249 formulas: since the Sāmaveda-Saṃhitā contains a much smaller number of texts applicable to domestic rites than the other *saṃhitās* the compilation of the Mantra-Brāhmaṇa was a necessity;[97] and, on the other hand, the occurrence in Gobhila's manual of many *mantras* which are not incorporated in that collection no doubt because the compiler of the latter work did not regard the corresponding acts as belonging to the *gṛhya*

---

author in concluding that "147 wedding *mantras* have been borrowed from *śrauta* sacrifices". It is simply impossible to arrive at such exactitude.

[91] MS. 4, 10, 1: 144, 10; TS. 1, 5, 11, 5; VS. 21, 5; KauśS. 52, 10; 79, 3, etc.

[92] HGS. 1, 3, 7 (rules for all libations from a ladle); 1, 8, 16 (oblations on the occasion of the beginning and the completion of the study); 1, 9, 7; 1, 17, 6; 1, 27, 1 (sacrifice on the occasion of the building of a house) etc.; compare also the variant formula in PGS. 1, 2, 11; BĀU. 6, 4, 24.

[93] See CALAND, in ZDMG 51, p. 133; cf. ĀpŚS. 1, 15, 4.

[94] ĀpŚS. 6, 27, 3; LŚS. 3, 3, 1; ŚGS. 3, 7, 2; HGS. 1, 29, 1. The *mantra* of ĀpŚS. 1, 15, 4 does not fit in with the context of MGS. 1, 14, 4f. See also p. 567f. above.

[95] Edition: H. STÖNNER, Das Mantrabrāhmaṇa, I. Prapāṭhaka, Thesis Halle 1901; H. JÖRGENSEN, Das Mantrabrāhmaṇa, II. Prapāṭhaka, Thesis Kiel 1911; there are editions with a Bengali translation or paraphrase by SATYAVRATA SĀMAŚRAMĪ, Serampore 1872; Calcutta 1873, in Uṣā 1 (1890). See also GONDA, V. L., p. 347, n. 28. In this collection the *mantras* stand in the order in which they are referred to by Gobhila.

[96] Cf. F. KNAUER, in: Festgruss R. von Roth, Stuttgart 1893, p. 61 and Das Gobhilagṛhyasūtra, II, Dorpat 1886, p. 22.

[97] See also OLDENBERG, in S. B. E. XXX, p. 10; RENOU, Écoles, p. 111; cf. p. 14.

rites proper;[98] part of these texts, being—like the citations from the Mantra-Brāhmaṇa—quoted *pratīkena*, are of sāmavedic origin.[99]

Just like Gobhila's work the Khādira-Gṛhyasūtra very rarely quotes the *mantras* in their complete form; they also can easily be identified in the Mantra-Brāhmaṇa.[100] The Jaiminīya Gṛhyasūtra, on the other hand, quotes many *mantras* from this collection in their complete form and never wholly agreeing.[101]

There exists a similar relation between the Āpastambīya Gṛhyasūtra and the Mantrapāṭha,[102] a collection which, presupposing the Saṃhitās of the Ṛg-, Yajur- and Atharvavedas, making (in 2, 21, 2–5) mention of the four Vedas and being older than the Kāṇḍānukrama of the Ātreyī *śākhā*,[103] can hardly be much later than the 4th century B.C.[104] The main difference between Āpastamba and Gobhila is that the former is more dependent on his *mantra* collection than Gobhila on the Mantra-Brāhmaṇa: the ritual as described in his manual is hardly intelligible from the *sūtras* alone. That the Sūtra was composed after the Mantrapāṭha and that its author had that 'prayer book' before his mind appears among other things from references to that collection by such phrases as "with the following *ṛc* stanza (or *yajus*)".[105] These references are in harmony with the fact that in the Kalpasūtra of the Āpastambins the Mantrapāṭha precedes, as the books XXV and XXVI, the Gṛhyasūtra which is book XXVII. Obviously the former text was learnt by heart before the study of the latter was commenced.[106] Tradition—colophons and commentators—do not however credit Āpastamba with the authorship of this collection which may have existed as an independent work before it was included in the Āpastambīya corpus.

On the relation between the above *mantra* collections and the *sūtra* works

---

[98] Cf. e.g. GGS. 3, 2, 48; 3, 3, 32; 3, 8, 2; 3, 9, 6; 3, 10, 22. See KNAUER, GGS. ed. II, p. 25; 28; 58.

[99] See also OLDENBERG, in S. B. E. XXX, p. 5.

[100] OLDENBERG, in S. B. E. XXIX, p. 371.

[101] CALAND, JGS. ed., p. XI.

[102] The Mantrapāṭha or the Prayer Book of the Āpastambins, edited ... and translated by M. WINTERNITZ, I, Oxford 1897. See also W. CALAND's review in GGA 1898, p. 950, where it is pointed out that the text of this 'prayer book' is given in the form known to the commentator Haradatta (ca. 15th century) whose work was, in Telugu characters and together with the texts of the Sūtra and the Mantrapāṭha, published at Chennipur 1890. The title Mantrapāṭha is warranted by a few manuscripts, other 'titles' being "The list of *mantras*" *(mantrasamāmnāya)* and "The chapter(s) on the *mantras*" *(mantrapraśna)*; the Telugu edition has the title Ekāgnikāṇḍamantrapraśnadvayam. As this "Section on the rites with a single fire" (Ekāgnikāṇḍa) it is an independent work. For a partial edition of a distinct version see K. MADHAVA KRISHNA SARMA in ALB 3 (1939).

[103] See GONDA, V. L., p. 325, n. 18; WINTERNITZ, ed., p. XXXVIII.

[104] WINTERNITZ, ed., p. XLV.

[105] For other particulars see WINTERNITZ, ed., p. XXXIII.

[106] For the few *mantras* which while occurring in the Sūtra are not found in the Mantrapāṭha, see WINTERNITZ, ed., p. XXXV.

there has been a controversy. On the strength of inconclusive arguments Oldenberg[107] was of the opinion that *mantras* and *sūtras* were 'composed together and on one common plan' but Winternitz and Caland[108] rightly emphasized the parallelism with the Vedic Saṃhitās which existed before there were any *śrautasūtras*. Moreover, certain inconsistencies prevent us from assuming identity of author, unless instead of the *sūtra* works extant one should think of older versions. The *mantra* collections which presupposed the ritual were no doubt also to fix the order of the individual acts in the memory of the priests.[109] Nevertheless, the relation and the chronological distance between the compilers remain completely uncertain.

The editor[110] did not fail to draw attention to the numerous grammatical irregularities in the text of the *mantras* most of which "can only be explained by assuming that these prayers were handed down by oral tradition—probably for centuries—among people who were no longer familiar with Vedic speech". It is in any case worth noticing that 117 of the 138 *mantras* of Taittirīya provenance are identical with the corresponding formulas in the basic texts, but only 45 of the 140 ṛgvedic *mantras* and 9 of the 120 atharvavedic formulas appear in their original form. As to the date of this collection it "cannot be much later than the 4th century B.C., though it may be much older".[111]

Curiously enough, Baudhāyana, Bhāradvāja, and Hiraṇyakeśin have frequently the same *mantras* (with their characteristic variants) as the Mantrapāṭha without however prescribing them for the same occasions.[112] Since these works have also some ungrammatical readings of *mantras* in common the conclusion may be that they derived their formulas from one source common to the schools of the Black Yajurveda.

There is another analogous case. Many *mantras* which, though foreign to the Taittirīya texts, are quoted only by their opening words in the Vaikhānasa-Gṛhyasūtra, were taken from the Mantra-Saṃhitā of this community, the first four chapters *(praśna)* of which run parallel to the Gṛhyasūtra.[113] The chapters

---

[107] Oldenberg, in S. B. E. XXX, p. 4; 249.

[108] Winternitz, ed., p. XXXI; Caland, in GGA 1898, p. 955; cf. also Knauer, GGS. II, p. 24; Renou, Écoles, p. 87; 112; Kashikar, S. Ś., p. 150.

[109] Compare BŚS. 24, 1: 185, 2: the correct order of the ritual acts must be understood from the order of the *mantras*.

[110] Winternitz, op. cit., p. XV; XXVIII; XL.

[111] Winternitz, ed., p. XLV.

[112] For some particulars see Winternitz, ed., p. XLII.

[113] For particulars see Caland, Vaikhānasasmārtasūtram, translation, p. X. This collection contains also the Taittirīya *mantras*. Caland consulted the Mantrasaṃhitā Vaikhānasīyā (in Grantha characters, containing eight chapters) described in the Catalogue of Sanskrit manuscripts in the Gov. Or. Library at Mysore, Mysore 1900, no. 25. Praśnas I—IV have been edited: Vaikhānasamantrapraśnaḥ sasvaraḥ praśnacatuṣṭayātmakaḥ, a Vedic lectionary in four *praśnas* for the ritual of the Vaikhānasa school of the Taittirīyas, ed. by Kṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭācārya, Kumbakonam 1910; and by B. D. Śeṣācārya, Madras 1920 (Grantha characters); in the Vaikhānasagranthamālā, no. 14, Akulamaṇṇādu 1926.

V–VIII of this Vaikhānasa-Saṃhitā–which cannot in its present redaction be contemporaneous with the *sūtras* of this community–are intended to accompany the complete ritual of the Vaikhānasas as described in Kāśyapa's manual.[114] The whole collection is still in use. The *mantras* contained in chapter IX, known as Viṣṇudaivatyam,[115] are not found in any other Kalpasūtra or Vedic text. Most of its 106 *mantras*–which end with *svāhā*–are in praise of Viṣṇu. Their language resembles that of the Vedic Puruṣa- and Śrīsūktas.

There is much to be said for the supposition[116] that already at an early date–that is, when domestic manuals were in the making–there must have existed more *mantra* collections of this type. The curious way of quoting *mantras* in the Kāṭhaka-Gṛhyasūtra–the ritual rule is often preceded by the opening words of the formula and followed by the complete formula–can most probably be explained by the supposition that the Kāṭhakas also possessed a separate *mantra* collection to which the text seems indeed to refer.[117] It is not even beyond possibility that such modern 'prayer books' as the Ṛgveda-Mantrasaṃhitā[118] and the Mantrabhāṣya which contains a commentary on the *mantras* of Pāraskara's manual[119] continue an old tradition. To these later compilations[120] belongs also the Āśvalāyana-Mantrasaṃhitā[121] which seems to owe its existence likewise to the desire to supply the want of a book containing the complete formulas;[122] it is nevertheless of importance for the history of the text.[123]

---

[114] I refer to T. GOUDRIAAN, Kāśyapa's Book of wisdom, Thesis Utrecht 1965 (The Hague 1965), p. 11; 313 and GONDA, M. R. L., p. 145. For the Vaikhānasa *mantras* see also GONDA, in IIJ 14 (1972), p. 1 and an article on the use of the Viṣṇusūkta to be published in Our Heritage, Calcutta.

[115] See P. GOPALAKRISHNAMURTY, Viṣṇudaivatyam of Vaikhānasa-Kalpasūtra, 21 AIOC II, 1 (Poona 1966), p. 36.

[116] WINTERNITZ, op. cit., p. XXXVIII; V. M. APTE, in ABORI 20, p. 249; RENOU, Écoles, p. 42.

[117] KGS. 25, 23; 63, 20; see CALAND, Kāṭhaka-Gṛhyasūtra, edition, p. VI and Brāhmaṇa- en Sūtra-aanwinsten, Amsterdam Acad. 1920, p. 466. The complete *mantras* were probably added by a diaskeuast.

[118] (Lithographically) published in Bombay 1891; see WINTERNITZ, op. cit., p. XXXIX.

[119] WINTERNITZ, ibidem.

[120] See also WINTERNITZ, op. cit., p. X, with n. 3 and RENOU, Écoles, p. 43 with n. 1. Many of these works have remained unpublished.

[121] See V. M. APTE, in ABORI 20 (1938–39), p. 249; cf. RENOU, in JA 236, p. 134. Textual criticism by V. M. APTE, in BDCRI 1, p. 394 (not completely convincing).

[122] The Āśvalāyana-Mantrasaṃhitā published at Poona 1884 contains *mantras* recited at domestic rites which are much later than those mentioned in the Gṛhyasūtra.

[123] The Āśvalāyana-Gṛhya-Mantra-Vyākhyā edited by K. SĀMBAŚIVA ŚĀSTRĪ, Trivandrum 1938 is a Sanskrit commentary on the *mantras*; see ch. VII, n. 18.

4. *The individual gṛhyasūtras*

The domestic ritual as described in the *gṛhyasūtras*, the rites and ceremonies normally performed by the householder and requiring the domestic fire which every householder was expected to maintain[1] is variable. As already observed authorities differ in the division of the rites and also in the number of the ceremonies included. Generally speaking the structure of these manuals presented no difficulties to the individual compilers when they wished to insert or omit certain ceremonies even in those cases in which these were obviously of 'popular' or 'non-Vedic' origin or belonged to the traditions of particular religious communities. Normally, the individual *gṛhyasūtras* presuppose the existence and knowledge of the *śrauta* manuals of the same school and quote the *mantras* of their own tradition *pratīkena*. Of the manuals extant three belong to the Ṛgveda, eleven to the Yajurveda, four to the Sāmaveda. Most of them being products of schools rather than individuals it is not surprising that in some cases there is some confusion of names and titles.

After the incomplete observations made by Bühler, Winternitz, Hillebrandt and Caland[2] on the Baudhāyana-Gṛhyasūtra[3] this comparatively long text, written in the usual *gṛhyasūtra* idiom, has not attracted much attention.[4] In the edition it consists of eleven chapters *(praśna)*—of fourteen if the Pitṛmedhasūtra is included. The first four chapters constitute the Gṛhyasūtra proper.[5] This is introduced by the statement that there exist seven forms of domestic sacrifices *(pākayajñasaṃsthā)* which are defined in the following *sūtras*,[6] viz. the *huta*, *prahuta*, *āhuta* (read *ahuta*) mention of which has already been made,[7] and the *śūlagava* (spit-ox offering), *baliharaṇa* (the throwing of oblations on the ground for the 'household gods'),[8] *pratyavarohaṇa* (the rite performed to signalize the giving up the use of a high couch:[9] the remainders of food given

[1] Although his wife may act for him and a brahmin may be employed in most cases. For particulars see KEITH, R. Ph. V. U., p. 358.

[2] G. BÜHLER, in S. B. E. XIV (Oxford 1882; Delhi 1969), p. XXXff.; WINTERNITZ, Hochzeitsrituell, p. 7; HILLEBRANDT, Rit., p. 30; CALAND, Über ... Baudhāyana, p. 30. These authors could not yet utilize a printed edition.

[3] The Bodhāyana-Gṛhya-sūtra edited by L. ŚRĪNIVĀSĀCHĀRYA, Mysore 1904 (uncritical, many misprints). The other edition mentioned in RENOU, Bibliographie védique, p. 81, viz. The Bodhāyana-Gṛhyasūtra edited by R. SHAMA SASTRI, Mysore 1920 is a somewhat corrected reprint of the first edition.

[4] See however KANE, H. Dh., I, Poona 1930, p. 20 (²Poona 1968, p. 38) and his frequent references to this text; KEITH, R. Ph. V. U., p. 28; 373.

[5] Corresponding to the chapters XXXIII—XXXV *(gṛhya)* and XXXVI *(gṛhyaprāyaścitta)* of CALAND's survey of the complete Baudhāyana-Kalpasūtra, in op. cit., p. 12.

[6] For other (different) enumerations see ŚGS. 1, 5, 1 (cf. 1, 1, 15); PGS. 1, 4, 1; Manu-Smṛti 3, 73.

[7] In the beginning of chapter III, 2.

[8] For other definitions see HILLEBRANDT, Rit., p. 74; KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 745, not mentioning Baudhāyana.

[9] Cf. KANE, H.Dh. II, p. 829.

on this occasion to brahmins are eaten by the householder and his company); and the *aṣṭakāhoma* (when a cow is killed for the deceased ancestors).

The rites dealt with in the following chapters and sections are arranged under these seven headings. The *saṃskāras*—beginning with the marriage rites and ending with the pupil's return home *(samāvartana)*—fill in their natural order the sections 1–11 of chapter I *(huta)*; the sections 2–4 *(jātakarman*[10]*–cūḍākarman: prahuta)*; 5–6 *(upanayana* and *samāvartana: āhuta)* of chapter II. Then follow the *śūlagava* (2, 7) and the other rituals mentioned above (2, 8–9; 10; 11). It is not surprising to find, among Baudhāyana's prescriptions, many peculiarities, among them the *upayamanīhoma* (1, 4, 12–23) mentioned between the seizing of the bride's hand and the treading on a stone,[11] the accompanying *mantras* (blessings) being in other *gṛhyasūtras* used in a similar context to consecrate burnt offerings.[12] However minute his treatment of, for instance, the respectful reception of the bridegroom and the ritual fire, Baudhāyana concentrates upon the subject under discussion without availing himself of the opportunity to insert references to other rites.[13]

The chapters III and IV comprise in the same order the rites and observances which 'imitate' or 'resemble'—i.e. are modelled on—the *huta, prahuta* and other ceremonies *(hutānukṛti* etc.). The first category consists of the annual opening of the Vedic studies *(upākarman)*[14] on the full moon day of Śrāvaṇa or Āṣāḍha (3, 1); the so-called Vedavratas—observances preceding the study of parts of the Veda—, here specified as *hotāraḥ* (i.e. the *mantras* in TĀ. 3, 1–5), *śukriyāṇi, upaniṣadaḥ, godānam* and *saṃmitam*,[15] and treated elaborately (3, 2 and 3); and the intermediate consecration *(avāntaradīkṣā)* by which one fortifies oneself with the view of successful observances (4).[16] The category of those rites which are ectypes of *prahutas* comprises a propitiatory rite for averting evil

[10] For some peculiarities see CALAND, Über . . . Baudhāyana, p. 31. A characteristic of Baudhāyana's domestic ritual is the obligation to place the remainders of the oblations on the leaves of certain trees to the accompaniment of a stanza addressed to Rudra and taken from the Śatarudriya hymn in TS. 4, 5; cf. BhGS. 2, 1, 16; 2, 5, 12; BhGŚS. 2, 10, 10. Moreover, the terminology used by Baudhāyana in connexion with the domestic sacrifices differs in some respects from that of other *sūtrakāras*; see P. N. U. HARTING, Selections from the Baudhāyana-Gṛhyapariśiṣṭasūtra, Thesis Utrecht 1922, p. XXX.

[11] Cf. PGS. 1, 1, 4. *upayamanī* is the name of the baked clay vessel etc. held beneath the vessel in which fire is carried.

[12] ĀpGS. 2, 5, 2; MGS. 1, 10, 8; VaikhSmS. 3, 3.

[13] Cf. e.g. PGS. 1, 2, 1ff.; 1, 3, 1ff.; 1, 4, 4ff. etc.

[14] Cf. KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 807; cf. ĀśvGS. 3, 5, 1ff. *(adhyāyopākaraṇa)*; PGS. 2, 10, 1ff. *(adhyāyopākarman)*; HGS. 2, 18, 1ff.; GGS. 3, 3, 1ff.; PGS. 3, 2, 16.

[15] See CALAND, Über . . . Baudhāyana, p. 32; KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 370; 372; HILLEBRANDT, Rit., p. 56. The names and procedure of these observances differ considerably in the several domestic manuals. Cf. also ŚGS. 2, 11f. (and OLDENBERG, in S. B. E. XXIX, p. 8; 69; 76); GGS. 3, 1, 28ff.; KhGS. 2, 5, 17ff.

[16] A shorter treatment of this rite in BhGS. 3, 6.

from one's house (*vāstuśamana*, 3, 5),[17] and a propitiation of portents (*adbhutaśānti*, 3, 6).[18] The rites belonging to the next group *(āhutānukṛti)* are the *āyuṣyacaru*, a sort of birthday sacrifice requiring oblations of rice or barley for the preservation of a boy's life (3, 7) and the *aṣṭamīvrata* (3, 8), a propitiatory ceremony on the eighth day involving an invocation of Rudra and the lighting of lamps in the god's sanctuary *(āyatana)*. The category of rites modelled on the *baliharaṇa* comprises the ritual closing of the course of Veda study (*utsarga*, 3, 9) to be performed in the month of Taiṣa (Pauṣa);[19] the offerings to the serpents (*sarpabali*, 3, 10) and a popular rite (3, 11) for neutralizing molestation caused by definite deities, the requisites being two images of women that are to be worshipped. The last category, the rites performed after the model of the *aṣṭakās* is larger and more varied (3, 12–4, 12), comprising the so-called *ābhyudayika (śrāddha)* to be performed when there is a lucky event[20] (3, 12), and measures to be taken in case of deviation from the regular order of rites (3, 13). Chapter IV (12 sections) deals with various *prāyaścitta* rites: for instance the *mantras* to be used when a bride is in her monthlies or is weeping (4, 1, 10f.); when a jackal is howling; when one has to cross a river etc. (4, 2, 12ff.) or to pass a *śmaśāna* (4, 3, 2ff.) when the axle of one's vehicle breaks (4, 4, 3ff.); *prāyaścittas* in connexion with *pākayajñas* (4, 5); or when certain rites have not been performed just in time (4, 6).

This *sūtra* the greater part of which is no doubt comparatively old, is composed in the Baudhāyana style; discussions, motivations and even implicit polemics are not absent.[21]

The Gṛhyasūtra proper is followed by the so-called Gṛhya-Paribhāṣāsūtra which consists of two chapters *(praśna)* or twenty-three sections *(adhyāya)*.[22] Being generally speaking a collection of paralipomena (additions and enlargements) it seems to owe its curious title to the desire of the compiler, not only to add some more definitions[23] and general rules of interpretation[24] but also, following the example given by the Karmāntasūtra of the Śrauta manual, to collect these in separate chapters annexed to the discussion of the *gṛhya* rites. This collection may in the course of time have become the nucleus of the present two chapters. That this text has been recast and greatly enlarged is beyond all doubt.

[17] See CALAND, Über . . . Baudhāyana, p. 33. Cf. also KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 834 Matsya-Purāṇa 256; 268, but no *gṛhyasūtras*.

[18] Cf. e.g. ŚGS. 1, 5; 8; 10; 11; ĀśvGS. 3, 7, 7; 3, 10, 9f.; GGS. 3, 3, 30f. and AVPar. 67; see also A. WEBER, Zwei vedische Texte über Omina und Portenta, Berlin Acad. 1859, p. 320.

[19] Cf. KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 815 and see e.g. GGS. 3, 3, 14; KhGS. 3, 2, 26.

[20] Cf. KANE, H. Dh. IV, p. 525; see e.g. ŚGS. 4, 4; ĀśvGS. 2, 5, 13ff.; VaikhSmS. 2, 1f.

[21] See e.g. BhGS. 3, 5; BhGPS. 1, 13.

[22] See J. GONDA, The Baudhāyana-Gṛhya-Paribhāṣā-Sūtra, in Vol. E. Waldschmidt, forthcoming. Some references in KANE, H. Dh., passim.

[23] Definitions occur in BhGPS. 2, 4, 15; 2, 6, 9f.

[24] For *paribhāṣās* see BhGPS. 1, 3, 6; 1, 4, 19; 1, 6, 5; 2, 6, 1; 7f.; compare also 2, 1, 28–38.

Bühler[25] already observed that "many of the newly-added rites do not belong to the ancient brahmanical worship".

Section 1, 1, entitled "Exposition of ritual chastity" *(brahmacaryavyākhāna)* and consisting of two parts, deals not only with this theme—which is furnished by TS. 6, 3, 10, 5 "On birth, a brahmin is born with a threefold debt, of pupilship (including chastity) to the *ṛṣis*, of sacrificial worship to the gods, of offspring to the Fathers"—but also with sacrificial cult. Section 2 deals with the status of a householder; 3 inter alia with the purification enjoined upon the man who is to perform Vedic rites; 4 with the proclamation of an auspicious day *(puṇyāha)*;[26] 5 with the preparation of the sacrificial place;[27] 6 with the *pākayajñas*; 7 with the marriage rites; 8 with various domestic rites and the marriage *śrāddha* on the tenth day; 9 with some special details; 10 with the time to place the fire on the fireplace *(agnyādheya)*; 11 with the "fire of the lying-in woman" *(sūtakāgni)*;[28] 12 with neglect of observances, infringement of rules, repetition of the 'investiture' (with the sacred thread).[29] The long chapter 13, being almost completely identical with BŚS. 17, 39—42, deals with the pupil's bath before returning home;[30] 14 with the one who has finished his observances without having finished his Veda study *(vratasnātaka)*;[31] 15 with a threefold division of *snātakas*; 16 with the obligations in connexion with the *aupāsana* fire (the ritual fire of a man who has not kindled the three *śrauta* fires). The much shorter chapter II begins with a section of varied contents; section 2 is devoted to the modes in which the sacred thread is worn; section 3 is an *āraṇyaka*like argumentation resulting in the thesis that one should sip water *(ācamana)*[32] with the sacrificial cord on one's left shoulder; section 4 deals mainly with the duties of the householder; 5 with particular cases of hospitality; 6 with various subjects; 7 (a later addition) with a rite for obtaining a son.

Providing the reader with information that has been omitted in the preceding chapters of Baudhāyana's corpus the compiler could not always avoid some repetition.[33] Though for the most part written in *sūtra* style his work is in places argumentative or even narrative in the *brāhmaṇa* manner;[34] it contains numerous quotations, not all of them identifiable. The *brāhmaṇa*like or *āraṇyaka*like[35] passages should not however induce us to characterize it as a sort of

[25] G. Bühler, in S. B. E. XIV, p. XXXII.

[26] See Kane, H. Dh. II, p. 216 and cf. BGŚS. 1, 10 (a longer, different and no doubt later text); C. G. Diehl, Punyāhavācana, OS 6, p. 97.

[27] See Kane, H. Dh. II, p. 207; cf. BGS. 1, 3, 1; BGŚS. 1, 8, 1; 1, 10, 2; 1, 15, 3.

[28] For the fire of confinement see Kane, H. Dh. II, p. 232; cf. PGS. 1, 16, 23; HGS. 2, 3, 4; 4, 8; ŚGS. 1, 25, 4; and see also VaikhSmS. 3, 15.

[29] Cf. VaikhSmS. 6, 10; ĀgnGS. 3, 10 and compare BŚS. 24, 18; 202, 10.

[30] For a survey of the contents see Caland, Über . . . Baudhāyana, p. 31.

[31] See Kane, H. Dh. II, p. 407; cf. PGS. 2, 5, 32; 34; GGS. 3, 5, 21f.

[32] See Kane, H. Dh. II, p. 314; cf. BGS. 2, 11, 48; GGS. 1, 1, 2; KhGS. 1, 1, 4ff.; BDhS. 1, 8, 4ff.

[33] Cf. 1, 7, 1f.; 1, 8, 21; 22—24.

[34] E.g. BhGPS. 1, 1, 18—30; 1, 3, 1—5 (a dispute of Viṣṇu and Soma).

[35] BhGPS. 1, 4, 10; 2, 6, 12; 2, 3, 1—4, 3; 2, 5, 22; for a motivation: 1, 6, 7; for

brāhmaṇa or as a collection of *brāhmaṇa*like fragments.[36] The text abounds in passages that are identical with or similar to paragraphs of the comparatively late Āgniveśya- and Vaikhānasa-Sūtras.

The third component of this domestic manual, the long Gṛhya-Pariśiṣṭa- or Gṛhya-Śeṣasūtra,[37] consists of older and later material. Rites that occur also in other works of this class and create the impression of being Vedic—for instance the Yamayajña in 1, 21 and the *vṛṣotsarga* in 3, 16—existed in all probability long before the compilation of these 'paralipomena'. This collection has on the other hand received considerable additions many of which no doubt dating from a much later moment than the composition of the Gṛhyasūtra proper. The latest additions do not belong to the Vedic, but to the post-Vedic, Hindu (so-called purānic) religions and rituals and concern the cult of typically Hinduist deities, Śiva, Durgā, Skanda.[38] Parallels, if any, occur only in other doubtless late specimens of this literature and further in works of the purānic and āgamic genres. Decidedly post-Vedic is the consecration of Viṣṇu dealt with in 2, 13[39] which resembles the three *adhyāyas* on the worship of this god VaikhSmS. 4, 10—12 in many particulars; the bathing of Viṣṇu (2, 15, in *ślokas*), the likewise Viṣṇuite daily worship of Mahāpuruṣa, requiring a formula in which the god is addressed with twelve names, Keśava, Nārāyaṇa, Govinda etc., and referring to sanctuaries which possess an image of the Mahāpuruṣa (2, 14); a section on the worship of Viṣṇu (3, 7) and two on the cult of (Rudra) Mahādeva addressed as Bhava, Śarva, Paśupati etc. (2, 17; 3, 15), two in which the bathing rite of Rudra is explained (2, 18; 21 (in *ślokas*)) and a long one on the installation rite *(pratiṣṭhā)* of an image of this god (2, 16; 2, 19 deals with a renewed consecration). Section *(adhyāya)* 22 discusses some moot points in connexion with the *pūjā* of the two great gods Viṣṇu and Śiva; it pretends to be in accordance with "the instructions originating in the religious practices of the three highest orders of society" as promulgated by Baudhāyana. The sections 3—6 and 8—10 of chapter III are devoted to the worship of Durgā, Upaśruti (a nocturnal deity revealing the future)—whose images are in the typically Hinduist manner bathed, adorned etc.—, Śrī, Sarasvatī, the Sun (Ravi), Jyeṣṭhā (one of the lunar mansions or constellations), and Vināyaka[40] (who here is invoked as "Lord of

---

explicative statements: 1, 2, 1ff.; 1, 5, 6; 1, 13, 23 etc.; for memorial stanzas corroborating an opinion of the compiler: 1, 1, 26ff.; 1, 2, 5; 1, 10, 5 etc.; quotations from the basic texts or other sources with "now it reads" e.g. 1, 2, 1; 2; 1, 6, 10; 1, 9, 1.

[36] Cf. CALAND, Über . . . Baudhāyana, p. 30.

[37] See BÜHLER, in S. B. E. XIV, p. XXXII; CALAND, Über . . . Baudhāyana, p. 30; HARTING, op. cit.

[38] For particulars see HARTING, op. cit., p. XVI.

[39] HARTING, op. cit., p. 1 and 28 (translation); 59 (text and translation of VaikhSmS. 4, 10—12). The other texts mentioned in this paragraph have likewise been edited and translated by Harting.

[40] For Jyeṣṭhā see ĀpGS. 8, 21, 10; PGS. 2, 13, 1; KANE, H. Dh. V, p. 524; for Vināyaka MGS. 2, 14 (with DRESDEN's note, MGS. ed., p. 157); see also P. VON

the obstacles" (Vighneśvara), "Lord of the World" etc.; a *bali* offering to Dhūrta "the Mischievous one" (a name of the god Skanda) is treated in the long section 4, 2.[41]

BGŚS. 1, 1 and 5, 1 deal with the rules concerning the so-called *agnimukhya*, the paradigm of the domestic fire cult (1, 2) consisting of introductory oblations of sacrificial butter, offered with some *mantras* and *yajus* formulas, the principal oblations, which vary according to the circumstances, and additional oblations. The section on the so-called *apūrva* form of the ritual (1, 3) is a sort of commentary on, and digression occasioned by, BGS. 1, 4, 43 defining the simplified form of the rite described in 1, 4, 41. BGŚS. 1, 4 deals with the preparation of the sacrificial place *(sthaṇḍila)* specifying the acts mentioned in BGS. 1, 3, 1; 1, 8 enumerates the deities presiding over the ritual acts and utensils and (in *ślokas*) the evil consequences of defects; 1, 9 and 10 deal with the *puṇyāha* ceremony; 11, repeating part of the formulations found in BGS. 2, 1, 23—31, with the naming of a child; 12 with the *karṇavedha* rite (the piercing of the lobes of a child's ear) which is not dealt with in the Gṛhyasūtra; 13 with a *nakṣatrahoma*, a name-day rite requiring sacrifices to the deities of the constellations,[42] probably as an alternative rite of the oblations dealt with in BGS. 3, 7; 14 with a *śānti* rite;[43] 15 with the *pratisarabandha* (the wearing of a ribbon round the wrist as an amulet);[44] 16, 17 and 18 with propitiatory rites;[45] 19 and 20 are probably the earliest texts dealing with rites for removing diseases etc. of horses and elephants;[46] 21 is a monthly propitiatory sacrifice in honour of Yama;[47] 22 (in *ślokas*) the *tṛṇagarbha* rite which annihilates evil and diseases—though ascribed to Baudhāyana (st. 15) no doubt a comparatively late section for the use of those who hope for admission to Viṣṇu's or Śiva's world (st. 12); 23 the unction of a king *(rājābhiṣeka)*;[48] 24 the so-called *śatābhiṣeka* by which one may attain intimate union (and residence in the same world) with Brahman.[49] Chapter II contains, inter alia, the *pañcamīśrāddha* (on the fifth day of the bright half of a month, section 1); particulars of the impregnation rite *(garbhādhāna)* that are not mentioned in BGS. 1, 7 (2); auspicious events etc. in connexion with a bride (3); a *prajārthihoma* for the benefit of a man who wishes to have offspring (4);[50] the Āditya-bali (5) which ensures the birth of a son and residence in heaven; the ceremonious adoption of a son (6);[51] the manufacture of a new sacred thread (7);[52] the *upana-*

Bradke, in ZDMG 36, p. 426; E. Arbman, Rudra, Uppsala 1922, p. 57; 219; Keith, R. Ph. V. U., p. 242.

[41] Cf. AVPar. 20 (translation: C. J. Goodwin, in JAOS 15 (Proc. 1890), p. V).

[42] Cf. Kane, H. Dh. II, p. 258; AVPar. 18b, 2, 9; 24, 1, 2; VaikhSmS. 6, 5; 3, 20f.

[43] Translated by Kane, H. Dh. V, p. 784.

[44] Cf. J. Gonda, in AO (Lugd.) 15, p. 311 (= S. S. II, p. 375); BGS. 1, 8, 9; ŚGS. 1, 12, 8; VaikhSmS. 2, 2.

[45] For the "hospitality offered to the planets" *(grahātithya)* in 1, 16 see Kane, H. Dh. II, p. 884; AVPar. 24, 1, 2; 70, 2, 4; ĀgnGS. 2, 5, 1; JGS. 2, 9; for the worship of the nine planets *(navagrahapūjā)* in 1, 17 Kane, H. Dh. II, p. 883; VaikhSmS. 4, 14; Yājñ. 1, 295.

[46] See Kane, H. Dh. V, p. 801 (with a translation of 1, 20).

[47] See Kane, H. Dh. II, p. 695; cf. TĀ. 6, 5; HPMS. 17, 1; BhPMS. 2, 6.

[48] For the term see ĀpŚS. 22, 28, 25; HŚS. 23, 4, 66; cf. BŚS. 18, 16—19 (considerably different).

[49] Cf. ĀgnGS. 2, 4, 6 (essentially identical).

[50] Cf. BGŚS. 4, 11; a parallel in ĀgnGS. 2, 5, 6.

[51] See Kane, H. Dh. III, p. 687; 1011.

[52] Cf. BGS. 2, 5, 8; BGPS. 2, 2, 13ff.

yana of a member of the second or third social order (and other subjects, 8);[53] the *upanayana* for disabled persons (9);[54] the performance of the same rite for an *aśvattha* tree (10);[55] additional or alternative regulations of the *upanayana* ritual (11); remarriage (12);[56] an elaborate note (20) on the preparation of the *pañcagavya*—the purificatory mixture of a cow's milk, curds, ghee, urine and dung,[57] a decidedly post-Vedic text (*sūtra* 5 mentions a temple)—ascribed to Baudhāyana. Section 15 on Viṣṇu's bathing is in verse. The first fifteen sections of chapter III are entitled *kalpa* "ritual procedure". For instance, section 1 and 2 treat the muttering of the syllable *Oṃ (praṇavakalpa)* and its correlate, the muttering of the formula *bhūr bhuvaḥ svaḥ*;[58] the *mṛtyuñjayakalpa* (11) is to ward off death;[59] the *abhivṛddhikalpa* for success or prosperity (12) involves the use of the Śrīsūkta (ṚVkh. 2, 6); rites to counteract the evil influences emanating from ants (13); to neutralize those of the birth of twins (14);[60] the *vṛṣotsarga* (16);[61] the procedure of giving dinner to one thousand brahmins and the sacrifice pertaining to it (17 and 18);[62] a remarkable ceremony performed by a householder for the benefit of his own soul while he is still alive (*jīvaśrāddha*, 19);[63] a more concise treatment of the same rite now called *ātmaśrāddha* and probably a later addition (with stanzas attributed to Kaṇva and Viṣṇu) in 22;[64] two different versions of a ritual procedure for the benefit of those who, according to other texts, have committed suicide or are killed by *cāṇḍālas*, snakes, lightning etc. (Nārāyaṇabali, 20; 21);[65] offerings given to crows etc. in order to induce them to augur the truth (*vāyasabali*, 23),[66] which the redactor had better included in chapter IV which begins with other *bali* rites. The *dharmopabhogavidhi* (4) is a complicated purificatory ritual; the *kāmyavidhi* (5) ensures the fulfilment of special wishes; the *śaucavidhi* (6) is a purificatory rite performed outside the village;[67] the *ācamanavidhi* (7) deals with sipping water;[68] section 8 with the sacred domestic fire;[69] 9 with the ceremonies of full and new moon performed by an *anāhitāgni*; 10 with the ritual obligations of the man who has two wives, viz. the union or association of two fires;[70] see also 4, 15. The *aupāsanāgnivimoka* (4, 12)[71] is the counterpart of this rite from which it is strangely enough separated by 4, 11 (the *prajārthihoma*) stating how to act in case of a brahmin remaining childless for ten years—the preparation of a *brahmaudana* is enjoined, which in

[53] Cf. BGS. 2, 5.

[54] See KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 297.

[55] No motivation is given. See KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 299.

[56] Cf. VaikhSmS. 6, 11—13 (different circumstances).

[57] See KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 773; IV, p. 141.

[58] Cf. KANE, H. Dh. IV, p. 121.

[59] See KANE, H. Dh. V, p. 814.

[60] Cf. AVPar. 67, 3, 2; ĀgnGS. 2, 7, 4; on twins see GONDA, Dual deities, p. 33 etc.

[61] See p. 563 above.

[62] See KANE, H. Dh. V, p. 445. At BhGŚS. 3, 17, 8 mention is made of Viṣṇu's heaven *(viṣṇuloka)*.

[63] See KANE, H. Dh. IV, p. 542 (with a translation).

[64] See KANE, H. Dh. IV, p. 544.

[65] See KANE, H. Dh. IV, p. 302; cf. VaikhSmS. 10, 9.

[66] See KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 745.

[67] Cf. BDhŚ. 3, 1, 25ff.

[68] See KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 652; cf. ĀgnGS. 2, 6, 1 (the *mantras* are essentially identical).

[69] See KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 557; cf. e.g. PGS. 1, 9; ĀgnGS. 2, 7, 2.

[70] ĀgnGS. 2, 7, 3 is a parallel passage.

[71] For the term ("the dissociation of the fires") see MŚS. 6, 2, 6, 20.

several other texts is said to be a ritual act to promote pregnancy.[72] Section 4, 13 informs us of the procedure of causing the fire to 'redescend' into oneself, the kindling sticks or a log of wood[73]—a rite to be performed by a man who intends to set out on a journey, a circumstance which is left unmentioned in the beginning of the section. Section 14 gives succinct instructions in case of the householder's passing away and of his domestic fire being interrupted. The Kapila-saṃnyāsavidhi (4, 16) is the procedure of becoming a *saṃnyāsin*.[74] The following section, unmistakably Viṣṇuite in tone,[75] emphasizes the sacramental aspects of renunciation (the fourth stage in a brahmin's career). The well-known Hinduist rite called *aṅkurārpaṇa* (dedication and germination of various seedlings) is the subject of 4, 18;[76] the *śrāddha* ceremony known as *nāndīmukha* that of 4, 19.[77] The sections 20 and 21 deal with *śānti* rites (neutralizing the evil effects of unusual events and a rite to be performed in case of a stroke of lightning).[78] Section 5, 2 is devoted to the *prāyaścitta* rite which is necessary if the bride is menstruating at the moment of the marriage sacrifice and other precautionary measures; 5, 3 to a *śānti* rite for averting the evil arising from menstruation *(ṛtuśānti)*;[79] 4 to the purificatory ritual of the clay-bath.[80] The *arkodvāhavidhi* (5) is the marriage with the *arka* plant recommended to those who are disabled or have lost two wives;[81] interestingly enough, the name *arka* seems to have led the ritualists to introduce worship of Āditya (the sun, *arka*) with the formula *sūryo devīm* (TB. 2, 8, 7, 1) into that ceremony. The *pañcamīśrāddha* (6) is to ensure the birth of a son; the *vanaspatihoma* (7)[82] is a rite in honour of the trees requiring the presence of the goddesses Śrī and Sarasvatī. The last section (5, 8, *ugrarathaśānti*)[83] is a propitiatory rite for a person who completes sixty years so that there is the possibility that he may die soon; it is performed until the present day.

This collection of rites is not too badly and unsystematically arranged. As to the date of its compilation it is certainly later than the Bhagavadgītā—in 2, 22, 9 BhG. 9, 26 is quoted. In the *grahaśānti* (1, 16) the names of the planets

---

[72] See GONDA, Savayajñas, p. 53, 55 etc.; MS. 2, 1, 12; BGPS. 1, 10, 9ff.; KauśS. 35, 5; BĀU. 6, 4, 14ff.

[73] Cf. ŚGS. 5, 1; BhGS. 3, 3; ĀgnGS. 2, 7, 2.

[74] See KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 954 (cf. p. 930; V, p. 1644) and compare BDh. 2, 10 1ff. and VaikhSm. 9, 6ff. Kapila's name occurs also in connexion with other rituals; cf. e.g. VaikhSmS. 3, 21.

[75] Cf. st. 7; 8; 12. Cf. also ĀgnGS. 3, 10, 4 *(yatisaṃskāra)*.

[76] Cf. GONDA, Aspects, p. 259.

[77] More or less parallel with BGS. 3, 12, 2ff.; see KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 286; cf. ŚGS. 4, 4; VaikhSmS. 2, 1; 6, 2; ĀgnGS. 2, 3, 2.

[78] See KANE, H. Dh. V, p. 741; cf. AVPar. 64; 70, 1, 3; 7, 4; VaikhSmS. 7, 4.

[79] There exist longer and independent texts on the same subject; see e.g. HARAPRASAD SHASTRI, A descriptive catalogue of Sanskrit manuscripts, Government Collection III, Calcutta 1925, p. 636: Ṛtuśānti or Rajodarśanaśāntiḥ by Kāśī Dīkṣita (extent: 500 *granthas*).

[80] For the term see AVPar. 1, 44, 1.

[81] See KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 546 and cf. the above BGŚS. 2, 10 and ĀpSmPr. 33.

[82] Cf. ĀpŚS. 20, 11, 15 and VādhūlaS. 78 (AO 4, p. 185).

[83] See KANE, H. Dh. V, p. 757f. For manuscripts dealing with this *śānti*—which is attributed to Śaunaka—and with its procedure *(prayoga)* see e.g. HARAPRASAD SHASTRI, op. cit., III, p. 619, no. 2574 (extent: 660 *ślokas*); in this manuscript Ugraratha is said to be (the demon of) the sixty years of age. The rite is also known as Ṣaṣṭipūrtiśānti.

occur in the Greek, not the Indian order. That means that the book contains passages which cannot have received their final form before the 3rd century A.D.[84] It is even probable that some sections are still later, for instance 2, 15 which contains a reference to Kṛṣṇa. Part of the Hinduist rites prescribed are not essentially different from their parallels in texts such as the Atharvaveda-Pariśiṣṭas and the āgamic literature. The language of the later portions in the Paribhāṣā- and Śeṣasūtras is not homogeneous; in part of the texts it is old-fashioned, elsewhere it resembles that of the *dharma* books and *purāṇas*;[85] there are non-Vedic stanzas.

The Bhāradvāja-Gṛhyasūtra[86] consists of three chapters *(praśna)* of 28, 32 and 21 sections *(kaṇḍikā)*. It does not seem to have been widely known in later times. The work is on the one hand characterized by a remarkable independence in the treatment of its subjects, and on the other by a somewhat unsystematic arrangement of the same, a fact which seems already to have struck the author of the commentary *(bhāṣya)* who in his introduction provides the reader with a modified succession of the contents. After the *upanayana* the *sūtra* treats the marriage, conception and birth rites—among them a rite for a rapid delivery (1, 22)[87] and one for protection of a woman in childbed (1, 23)—etc. (chapter I), adding in II and III a considerable variety of rituals and ceremonies—for instance, the monthly *śrāddha*[88] (2, 11–14); how to defeat opponents in a contest (2, 26); the *aupāsana* fire (in which the daily offerings are made; 3, 1–3); ceremonies in connexion with the investiture with the sacred thread etc. (3, 4f.); the reception of a deceased person into the communion of the fathers to whom rice balls are offered[89] (3, 17). There are many *mantras* in this work that are either foreign to the Taittirīya tradition or appear in a modified form. The commentator, who quotes a number of other *gṛhyasūtras* and *dharma* works, gives *prayogas* after his explanations of the several parts of the *sūtra* text.[90] As to their style the Bhāradvāja Śrauta- and Gṛhyasūtras are almost uniform and have therefore been attributed to the same author.[91]

The short domestic manual of Āpastamba[92] constitutes chapter (or book,

---

[84] See HARTING, op. cit., p. XXIV.

[85] See e.g. the metrical sections BGŚS. 1, 22 (mentioning in st. 8 Viṣṇu's thousand names) and 2, 21 (a reference to (a) *purāṇa(s)*).

[86] Editions (with a Telugu commentary by I. VENKATARAMA SASTRI, Ongole 1897; (in Devanāgarī) at Kumbakonam 1966 (with a commentary) based on an older edition; (in Grantha characters) published at Kumbakonam and in H. J. W. SALOMONS, Het Hindoesche huisritueel volgens de school van Bhāradvāja, Thesis Utrecht 1913 (Sanskrit text and introduction in English). See also KASHIKAR, Bh. Ś. S. I, p. XLI, and in BDCRI 35 (1975), p. 65 (also on the commentary).

[87] Cf. KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 228.

[88] Cf. KANE, H. Dh. IV, p. 361.

[89] See KANE, H. Dh. IV, p. 520.

[90] For the *bhāṣya* see SALOMONS, op. cit., p. XVII. An undefined *dharma* work mentioned by this author may have been a Bhāradvāja manual.

[91] KASHIKAR, S. Bh., I, p. XLIII.

[92] Edition: M. WINTERNITZ, The Āpastambīya Gṛhyasūtra with extracts from

praśna) XXVII of the Āpastambīya-Kalpasūtra, where it follows the *paribhāṣās* (in part of ch. XXIV) and the *mantras* for the *gṛhya* rites (XXV and XXVI)[93] and precedes the Dharmasūtra (XXVIII and XXIX) and the Śulvasūtra (XXX) which concludes the work. The close relation with the Śrautasūtra[94] convinced Bühler[95] and Garbe that the whole corpus is the work of one and the same author. Oldenberg[96] however had grave doubts about the correctness of this traditional opinion and the considerable differences in style between the *śrauta* and *gṛhya* works are certainly not in favour of the identification. The latter is very succinct, not free from lacunas and not averse to compounds: 1, 1, 2–4:

udagayanapūrvapakṣāhaḥpuṇyāheṣu kāryāṇi. yajñopavītinā. pradakṣiṇam "the (rites) must be performed during the northern course of the sun, on days of the bright fortnight, on auspicious days; by one who has his sacrificial cord suspended over the left shoulder; from left to right".

The text, which is divided into eight sections *(paṭala)* and twenty-three subsections *(khaṇḍa)* is closely connected with the Gṛhyasūtra of Hiraṇyakeśin—whose school is later in time—the chief difference being that Āpastamba, like Gobhila, gives the ritual rules without the *mantras* which, as already observed, are contained in a special collection, the Mantrapāṭha,[97] whereas Hiraṇyakeśin joins Śāṅkhāyana, Āśvalāyana, Pāraskara in interweaving the rules with the *mantras*, which is the more usual practice.[98] Notwithstanding the conciseness of this work it contains a number of interesting customs and prescripts,[99] among them in the section on the election of a bride the advice to let the girl touch one of a number of auspicious or inauspicious objects.[100]

The Gṛhyasūtra of Hiraṇyakeśin,[101] constituting the *praśnas* XIX and XX

---

the commentaries of Haradatta and Sudarśanārya, Vienna 1887; an edition in Grantha characters, printed at Tanjore 1885 gives the *mantras pratīkena*; other editions by A. Mahādeva Śāstrī (with the comm. of Sudarśanārya), Mysore 1893; M. A. Vaidyanātha Śāstrī (with the same comm.), Kumbakonam 1903; by A. Chinnaswami Sastri (with the two comm.), Benares 1928 (reprinted). Translation: H. Oldenberg, in S. B. E. XXX, Oxford 1892 (Delhi 1964), p. XXXII. For the commentaries see chapter VII.

[93] See the preceding section.

[94] See R. Garbe, The Śrauta Sūtra of Āpastamba, edited, III, Calcutta 1902, p. XII.

[95] G. Bühler, The sacred laws of the Āryas, I, S. B. E. II, Oxford ²1896, p. XIII.

[96] Oldenberg, in S. B. E. XXX, p. XXXII.

[97] See the preceding section, n. 102. For the controversy on the relation between the *mantra* collection and the *sūtra* work see above, p. 579.

[98] Oldenberg, in S. B. E. XXX, p. 249.

[99] See A. Chattopadhyay, Some social aspects in the Āpastamba-Gṛhyasūtra, IA 3, 2 (1967), p. 37.

[100] ĀpGS. 1, 3, 14ff.; ĀśvGS. 1, 5, 4f.; GGS. 2, 1, 3ff.

[101] Edition with extracts from the commentary of Mātṛdatta by J. Kirste, Vienna 1889 (see also the same, in Sitzungsberichte Wien 124, 4; Böhtlingk, in ZDMG 52, p. 81; 54, p. 177; 613; Caland, in ZDMG 51, p. 128; 136; 53, p. 214;

of the *kalpa* of the Hairaṇyakeśas, differs from Āpastamba's domestic manual in mentioning the *mantras*—often quoted serially—together with the ritual rules in a greater length, a modified arrangement of the subject-matter and, in places, a more facile—though sometimes irregular—mode of expression. While being to a certain extent utilizable as a sort of commentary on Āpastamba's Sūtra—to which it is posterior—it seems to have borrowed from Baudhāyana and Bhāradvāja and to have thrown the differences with Āpastamba's school into relief. Like other works of this genre it includes some references to matter that properly speaking belongs to expositions of the *dharma*.[102] A learned ritualist, Mātṛdatta, who seems to have lived before the end of the 16th century,[103] wrote a commentary in which he quotes many opinions of predecessors.[104] There is a *paddhati*[105] and there exist many other secondary works of the *prayoga* variety.[106]

The Vādhūlas have possessed a domestic manual. This appears from their collection of *mantras* which contains in the first place[107] the formulas required for the *gṛhya* rites.[108] Although the Gṛhyasūtra has not yet been found one of the two *vyākhyās* that accompany it, viz. the Vādhūla-Gṛhyakalpa-Vyākhyā,[109] has in all probability preserved some parts of it. The section on the funeral rites—which may have belonged to the Vādhūla-Pitṛmedhasūtra—and the section on the *upanayana* contained in this Vyākhyā are fragments of the Gṛhyasūtra rather than commentatorial texts. The former fragment even includes some aetiological *brāhmaṇa* passages. Moreover, a comparison between the quotations contained in these *vyākhyās* and the Āgniveśya-Gṛhyasūtra shows that the former refer to a domestic manual that is very closely related to the latter. Both traditions seem to continue one and the same older school: the manuscripts of the Vādhūla *vyākhyās* come from Kerala, those of Āgniveśya from the Tanjore district.

On the strength of a passage in the Vyākhyā of the Vādhūla-Sūtra[110] which has been confirmed by other information[111] the Āgniveśya-Gṛhyasūtra[112] must

---

Oldenberg, in ZDMG 55, p. 258); also (as ch. 19 and 20) in the Poona edition (1927) of HŚS.; English translation by H. Oldenberg, in S. B. E. XXX, p. 133.

[102] Cf. also Bühler, in S. B. E. II, p. XXV (exaggeratedly).

[103] See Kirste, op. cit., p. IX.

[104] HGS. 1, 26 left out in this commentary seems—like 2, 18—20—to be a later addition; cf. Kirste, op. cit., p. VIII.

[105] Sanskar Ratna Mala by Shri Gopee Nath Bhatt Oak, edited and revised by Rāma Kṛṣṇa Śāstrī, Benares 1898 (as far as I know incomplete).

[106] For which see Renou, Bibliography, p. 81.

[107] Cf. also Witzel, in SII 1, p. 88.

[108] Caland, in AO 4, p. 2; Witzel, in SII 1, p. 84; 103.

[109] Cf. Witzel, in SII 1, p. 88; for the other commentary, viz. the Vādhūla-Kalpasūtra-Vyākhyā see Caland, in AO 1, p. 5 and Witzel, in SII 1, p. 90.

[110] Mention of which has been made in chapter II, 5.

[111] See N. Tsuji, The marriage-section of the Āgniveśya-Gṛhyasūtra, in Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko 19, Tokyo 1960, p. 43. Quotations

be regarded as a product of a subdivision of the Vādhūla school.[113] This is not to say that its relations to the Vādhūla tradition and to the other Taittirīya schools are completely clear and that we are well informed of the Āgniveśya school and its eponymous *sūtrakāra*.[114] The name Āgniveśya, probably a patronymic,[115] occurs in the commentary on the Taittirīya-Prātiśākhya (9, 4) where he is said to be the founder of a *śākhā* and twice in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad (2, 6, 2; 4, 6, 2) in lists of teachers;[116] a "great seer" of that name occurs also in the Mahābhārata (1, 121, 6; 1, 122, 24). Whereas Madhvācārya (13th century) cites the Āgniveśya *śruti* in support of his contentions, Appaya Dīkṣita (±1600) belittled the authority of this school.[117] There is epigraphic evidence of its presence in the South[118] where even today a few Tamil families are attached to it.[119]

This manual—which repeatedly relies on the authority of *bhagavān* Āgniveśya[120] and must therefore be the work of a member of the school—consists of three chapters *(praśna)*. Praśna I covers the rites connected with studentship and marriage, II deals with the *saṃskāras* from the *puṃsavana* to the *cauḍa* and many other rites; III mainly with *śrāddhas*, *pitṛmedha* etc. Though incorporating the *mantras* used by the Taittirīyas it creates the impression of being towards the end of the 'Vedic period' made up of several elements by a compiler belonging to a community that inclined to ritual eclecticism. ĀgnGS. 1, 1, 1–4 is, with slight variants, almost identical with HGS. 1, 1–8 *(upanayana)*; the section on name-giving (2, 1, 5) is closely related to HGS. 2, 4, 6–19, and so on; in ĀgnGS. 3, 6–9[121] there is "a wholesale borrowing from the Baudhāyana-Pitṛmedhasūtra".[122] The compiler's style and his way of formulating remind the reader on one hand of the other yajurvedic *sūtras*, and on the other of works that are alien to that tradition. His *sūtra* work combines, so to say, the characteristics of *kalpasūtras* and *dharma (smṛti)* texts. The apparent cause of

in the Vādhūla comm. refer to the ĀgnGS. (or to a work that is closely related to it).

[112] Āgniveśyagṛhyasūtra, edited by L. A. Ravi Varma, Trivandrum 1940; a translation does not exist.

[113] Cf. also Ravi Varma, op. cit., p. III; M. Witzel, in SII 1 (1975), p. 84.

[114] Cf. also Caland, in AO (Lugd.) 1, p. 7.

[115] Whether or not a descendant of Agniveśa's son mentioned in ṚV. 5, 34, 9 is unknown.

[116] It is not certain whether Āgniveśya, a disciple of Śāṇḍilya and Ānabhimlāta and Āgniveśya, "a disciple of Gārgya", are one and the same person. These places do not prove that the Āgniveśyas are an offshoot of the Śāṇḍilya school modified by the Gārgya tradition.

[117] See Ravi Varma, op. cit., p. III.

[118] Renou, Écoles, p. 204.

[119] Ravi Varma, op. cit., p. VII: "There are now (1940) only eleven families following this Sūtra and they are all, in one way or other, related to each other . . ."

[120] See ĀgnGS. 2, 4, 3: 62, 16; 2, 4, 5: 65, 3; 2, 4, 6: 67, 9 etc.

[121] P. 140–170; for particulars see Tsuji, op. cit., p. 44.

[122] For the ĀgnGS. owing material to the BhārGS. see also Kashikar, S. Bh. I, p. XLI.

this double character is the strong tendency to incorporate rites that are foreign to the *sūtra* tradition or have at least no parallels in the older *gṛhya* works. One of these, the *sthāgara alaṃkāra* (marking the foreheads of a newly wedded couple with *sthagara* "a fragrant powder"), may be translated in full,[123] 1, 7, 1:

"Now we shall describe the *sthāgara alaṃkāra:* A mirror, ointment, an unwashed (i.e. new) garment, everything fragrant, rice-grains, the upper and lower millstone, these are the necessaries ready for this (rite). After the ceremony of the hand-taking (marriage), in the (next) morning the mother-in-law, or the father-in-law, or the wife's brother, having besmeared the sacrificial ground *(sthaṇḍila)*, which measures a *gocarma*[124] and is quadrangular, with cow-dung, having besprinkled (consecrated) it and scratched the (five) lines,[125] sprinkled water over it—having clothed themselves in a clean, light-coloured, dry (garment), the married couple, with well-washed hands and feet, having sipped water, holding *darbha* grass in the hands sit down in the western half of the sacrificial ground. Having, on the eastern side, scattered rice-grains and placed the upper and lower millstone he (the person officiating) covers (them) with a new garment. After having celebrated with perfumes, flowers, incense and lights, with barley-corns, unhusked grain and rice-grain he mutters from (in) the east the *daśahotar mantras*[126] (beginning with) 'the sacrificial ladle is thought', from (in) the south the *caturhotar mantras*[127] (beginning with) 'the earth', from (in) the west the *pañcahotar mantras*[128] (beginning with) 'the *hotar* is Agni', from (in) the north the *ṣaḍhotar mantras*[129] (beginning with) 'your eye is the sun', from above the *saptahotar mantras*,[130] (beginning with) 'the *hotar* is *mahāhavis*'. At the (same) time the sister of the newly married husband, in the west (side of the sacrificial ground), having with the upper and lower millstone (and) seated while facing the east ground everything fragrant and offered (it) to the gods, anoints (them) with ointment. Having made (them) look at the mirror and having with the remainder 'adorned' the daughter on her face with the *mantras* (beginning with) 'Agni with the *yajuḥ* formulas'[131] and 'Senā is Indra's (spouse)'[132] subsequently she 'adorns' the son-in-law. And what on this occasion the women say that they do. She becomes dear. 'He indeed becomes dear', thus a *brāhmaṇa*".[133]

---

[123] According to RAVI VARMA, op. cit., p. X this practice seems to be current in parts of Bengal and to resemble a 'ladies' rite' that is still in vogue in Kerala.

[124] For definitions of this measure of land see KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 859, n. 2021 (inter alia, a place large enough for a hundred cows, one bull, and their calves).

[125] *lakṣaṇam ullikhya*: the sacrificial ground (KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 208) is to be prepared by drawing five lines; see e.g. GGS. 1, 1, 9f.; 4, 2, 8; 18f.; KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 209.

[126] That is, the ten sentences occurring in MS. 1, 9, 1; KS. 9, 8; TĀ. 3, 1f., being a portion of the *caturhotar* formulas.

[127] TĀ. 3, 1—5.

[128] A particular formula in which five deities are named as *hotar* and other sacrificial priests.

[129] TĀ. 3, 4.

[130] TĀ. 3, 5.

[131] TĀ. 3, 8 etc.; cf. ĀpŚS. 10, 3, 6; MŚS. 2, 1, 1, 17.

[132] TĀ. 3, 9, 1 etc.; cf. ĀpŚS. 11, 3, 14; the formula enumerates "the wives of the deities".

[133] Cf. ŚB. 13, 1, 9, 8.

Other popular rites and customs that have no parallels in the older *gṛhya* works are:[134] the Ravikalpa in honour of the Sun, a rite to be performed on a Sunday by a person who desires a long and prosperous life and involving the worship of twelve images of the sun-god (2, 4, 11); the *kūṣmāṇḍa* rite prescribed for a man who has discharged semen in a dream (2, 4, 4);[135] the ceremony called *kautuka(bandhana)*, i.e. the tying of a protective thread round the wrist of an initiated boy (2, 3, 5).[136] There is a Viṣṇubali (2, 5, 7) which is identical with BGS. 1, 11[137] and a *punarupanayana*, half in prose, half in *ślokas*, intended to purify and receive again into the community the man who had neglected his ritual duties (2, 7, 1). The rules for persons in the third and fourth periods of life (*vānaprastha* or "anchorite" and *saṃnyāsin* "one who completely renounces the world") in 2, 7, 10 and 11 are usually dealt with in *dharma* books.[138]

The Vaikhānasas,[139] nowadays a small endogamous group of Viṣṇuites residing mainly in Tamil and Telugu speaking districts of South India where they serve in several temples, claim to derive their name from their founder, the sage Vikhanas and to be the oldest Viṣṇuite community.[140] In their opinion they constitute at the same time a Vedic school, regarding the worship of Viṣṇu in his image form which they practise as a transformation of the Vedic 'shapeless' *(amūrta)* cult. However, the name Vaikhānasa is, in books on *dharma* and elsewhere, often applied to an order of forest hermits[141] whereas according to a tradition handed down in *brāhmaṇas*[142] the Vaikhānasas were seers dear to Indra. Whatever the status and functions of the ancient Vaikhānasas and their relations to those who bear that name in modern times may have been, it is an established fact that already in early post-Vedic and post-epic times they constituted in the South an important Viṣṇuite current claiming to have clung to Vedic orthodoxy.[143] In any case, they possess *sūtra* texts that are regarded as representing a school of the Taittirīyas.[144] Scholars have often concluded that they constitute a Vedic school which already in their *sūtra* texts give evidence of having introduced many non-Vedic rites and practices—and

---

[134] See G. M. Panse, Āgniveśya-Gṛhyasūtra, an analytical study, VIJ 4 (1966), p. 44.

[135] Cf. Kane, H. Dh. II, p. 958.

[136] Cf. Kane, H. Dh. II, p. 536.

[137] Mention of some other rites which Āgniveśya has in common with Baudhāyana has already been made. Cf. also VaikhSmS. 3, 13.

[138] See Kane, H. Dh. II, p. 416.

[139] See W. Caland, Over het Vaikhānasasūtra, Amsterdam Acad. 1926 (with a summary in English); On the sacred books of the Vaikhānasas, Amsterdam Acad. 1928; Vaikhānasa-Śrautasūtram, Calcutta 1941, p. XXVIII; Gonda, Aspects, p. 234; R. I. I, p. 217; II, p. 125; V. Ś., p. 78 etc.

[140] For references etc. see Gonda, M. R. L., p. 140.

[141] See Kane, H. Dh. I, [1]p. 105; [2]p. 257; II, p. 917.

[142] PB. 14, 4, 7; JB. 3, 190; see W. Caland, Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa, Calcutta 1931, p. 358; Kane, H. Dh. II, p. 418.

[143] One of their texts, the Atri-Saṃhitā 1, 29 speaks of the Vaikhānasa *śākhā* of the Veda.

[144] For the Śrautasūtra see chapter II, 5.

in this they are, as appears from the younger Baudhāyana *sūtra* texts etc., not alone.[145] More precisely they could perhaps be described as deriving their origin from a group of ascetics who, while being affiliated to the conglomerate of Vedic schools and attaching much importance to faithfulness to Vedic traditions, worshipped Nārāyaṇa with strong leanings to Viṣṇuite ritualism. Apart from the *sūtras* which in all probability are the latest specimina of this genre[146] and were not definitively drawn up before the 4th century of the Christian era this community produced many other works.[147]

The chapters *(praśna)* I–VII of the Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra[148] (I–VII of the complete corpus) deal with *gṛhya* rites–among these, V with the funeral rites, VI with *prāyaścittas* and VII with *prāyaścittas* for the funeral rites–; the chapters VIII–X (VIII–X) constitute the Dharmasūtra of this community.[149] Both parts are almost identical in style[150] and may be regarded as the work of the same compiler. The contents of the chapters I–IV are the following. I: after the enumeration of the *saṃskāras*[151] the compiler deals with rules for bathing for students, householders, anchorites and ascetics; the daily offering of libations of water *(tarpaṇa)*; the ceremony of blessing *(puṇyāha)*, the place for the domestic fire and the requisites for the sacrificial cult; the normal paradigma of a sacrifice; II: the so-called Nāndīmukha-śrāddha,[152] the initiation in the study of the Veda and the relevant *vratas* and ceremonies; III: the marriage ceremonies, rites of conception and pregnancy, birth, tonsure etc.; IV: a variety of rites such as the *sthālīpāka*, the *āgrayaṇa*, the *aṣṭakā*, the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*, *śrāddha*, *caitrī* and *āśvayuji* sacrifices, the daily worship of Viṣṇu and the appeasing of the planets.

---

[145] See e.g. GONDA, Aspects, p. 234; RENOU, E. V. P. VI, p. 8; 17.

[146] See CALAND, Over het Vaikhānasasūtra, p. 6. The thesis advanced by CALAND, ibidem, with regard to the relation between the Vaikhānasa-Smārtasūtra and the Mānava-Dharma-Śāstra (the author of the latter must have known the former) is open to argument.

[147] For which see GONDA, M. R. L., chapter IX.

[148] Edited by W. CALAND, Vaikhānasasmārtasūtram. The domestic rules of the Vaikhānasa school belonging to the Black Yajurveda, Calcutta 1927. Translation: W. CALAND, Vaikhānasasmārtasūtram, Calcutta 1929 (with an introduction and notes).

[149] As to the Dharmasūtra (published also by T. GANAPATI SASTRI, The Vaikhānasa Dharmapraśna of Vikhanas, Trivandrum 1913) see TH. BLOCH, Über das Gṛhya- und Dharmasūtra der Vaikhānasa, Leipzig 1896; W. EGGERS, Das Dharmasūtra der Vaikhānasas übersetzt . . . Nebst einer Einleitung über den brahmanischen Waldeinsiedler-Orden und die Vaikhānasa-Sekte, Göttingen 1929; KANE, H. Dh. I, [1]p. 105; [2]p. 257; J. D. M. DERRETT, in this History, IV, p. 39. It is in all probability a recast of older materials dealing with the four periods of life (student, householder, anchorite and ascetic), rules for sipping water, bathing, eating, purification etc.

[150] See also CALAND, VSmS., Translation, p. X; BLOCH, op. cit., p. 22; VSmS. 1, 8 the author refers to 8, 6.

[151] See section III, 2 above.

[152] See KANE, H. Dh. IV, p. 527.

In the sections 4, 10–12, the daily worship of Viṣṇu, the *sūtra* comprises a form of regular worship of Viṣṇu which is to take place after an obligatory domestic fire sacrifice. Being considered equal to the worship of all the gods—the author quotes AiB. 1, 1, 1: "Agni is the lowest, Viṣṇu is the highest of the gods; between these two are all the other deities"—this rite is to be performed "after the evening and morning sacrifices by everyone who has established (an image of) the highest god Viṣṇu in his dwelling". The chapters contain rules for the construction and consecration of the image, the preparation of the fireplace, the Hinduist sacrificial rites, the offerings, the texts to be pronounced—among these the Puruṣa hymn (ṚV. 10, 90),[153] a meditation on the analysable Highest Self *(sakalaparamātmā)* as the indispensable complement of the concentration on Viṣṇu's unanalysable *(niṣkala)* aspect as Brahman being in the worshipper's own heart, which has preceded, an invocation of Puruṣa, Nārāyaṇa, Viṣṇu etc.—; bathing, the installation of Viṣṇu, the presentation of sacrificial food and various other rules requiring the recitation of Vedic Viṣṇu *mantras*.[154]

These sections are far from being the only evidence of Viṣṇuite influence. On the contrary, the traditional portions of this work contain many references to oblations offered to Viṣṇu, invocations of the god and other traces of his cult. For instance, the recitation of ṚV. 1, 22, 16–21, in which his famous three steps are the main object of glorification, is repeatedly quoted;[155] in other *smārta-sūtras* only parts of these stanzas are occasionally prescribed. Other Viṣṇu verses are found in many sections.[156] In the sections on the normal paradigm for a sacrifice *mantras* containing Viṣṇu's name are prescribed.[157] As a special rite not mentioned in other *gṛhyasūtras* the section on the sacrifice on the day of full moon in Caitra (4, 8) includes a sacrifice dedicated to Śrī and her husband Viṣṇu. Especially in the chapters VI and VII which contain the numerous *prāyaścittas* the god's name is a frequent occurrence.[158] If for instance the proper time for the name-giving has passed one should offer an oblation to Viṣṇu; if one has married a girl that has reached puberty one should perform a penance and sacrifice *prāyaścitta* oblations to Viṣṇu and Savitar.[159]

Other passages of interest are VaikhSmS. 1, 14 where four rays of Agni (the sacrificial fire) are said to convey the oblations to the sun, which makes the moon (king Soma) increase which in its turn gratifies the god (for whom the sacrifice is intended) with nectar; 2, 18 dealing with the *prāṇāgnihotra*;[160] 3, 10 mentioning some symptoms of pregnancy; the statement in 3, 21 that the man who "has seen a thousand moons", that is, has reached the age of eighty years

[153] See GONDA, V. L., p. 137 etc.

[154] ṚV. 1, 154, 2 (TB. 2, 4, 3, 4); ṚV. 1, 122, 18 (TB. 2, 4, 6, 1); ṚV. 1, 154, 1 (TS. 1, 2, 13i); ṚV. 1, 22, 20 (TS. 1, 3, 6l) etc.

[155] See e.g. VaikhSmS. 1, 5; 6; 2, 2; 3, 17; 21; 6, 9.

[156] E.g. VaikhSmS. 1, 4; 10; 12, 15; 21; 6, 1.

[157] VaikhSmS. 1, 16–21; see also 1, 10, 12 and 15.

[158] For Nārāyaṇa see e.g. VaikhSmS. 1, 3; 4; 2, 11; 3, 19.

[159] VaikhSmS. 6, 4; 13; cf. 6, 5; 6; 11.

[160] Compare CALAND, Translation, p. 65 and BDhS. 2, 18, 8f.

and eight months, is "Brahman's body provided with the rites and highly meritorious"; 3, 22b on the visit of a father and his son to the temple of Guha (i.e. Skanda) and especially the introductory and completely expositive 5, 1 on the way of death:

> the moribund person should know that there are two paths: after death he can without returning to mundane existence reach the abode of Brahman by the bright ritual fire (in which he is cremated), the day, the northern course of the sun, fire and light, or return to the earth by the dark smoke of the fire, night, the southern course, the light of the moon. In order to reach the former goal he has to recite definite Vedic *mantras* and fix his mind on Brahman. After this paragraph there follows a theory of the process of dying: in the moribund person the waters consume the quality of smell of the earth; then the body becomes dissolved; fire enters it and the blood is dried up; the internal wind, shaking it, makes it swoon etc.

Section 5, 9 dealing with abnormal cases of death attests to the occurrence of the so-called *Totenhochzeit*:[161] when a *snātaka* who has not yet become a householder dies a girl of the same social status should dwell one night with him before he is cremated. A similar rule applies to an adult but unmarried girl.

While this work comprises many rites and customs that are foreign to the older ritual *sūtras*, the compiler has, especially in the chapters on the *saṃskāras*, followed Hiraṇyakeśin, without however understanding all text-places of this authority correctly.[162] His language is not free from irregularities and in its syntax, from Dravidian influence, enumerations and long sentences. There are definitions and explanations.[163]

The Kāṭhaka-Gṛhyasūtra,[164] also known as Laugākṣi-Gṛhyasūtra,[165] is the domestic manual of those who followed the Kāṭhaka recension of the Black Yajurveda.[166] According to commentators[167] and the tradition of the brahmins of Kashmir who have held the rules given in this manual in esteem for a long time the author is Laugākṣi (or Lokākṣi).[168] That the Kashmirians studied it intensively appears from a vast literature which they based on it. The earliest explanatory work is a brief gloss *(vivaraṇa)* by Ādityadarśana (of uncertain

---

[161] O. SCHRADER, Totenhochzeit, Jena 1904; CALAND, Over het Vaikhānasa-sūtra, p. 13.

[162] See BLOCH, op. cit., p. 7; CALAND, Over het Vaikhānasasūtra, p. 5, and CALAND's notes, e.g. on 2, 6; 3, 23.

[163] E.g. 1, 1; 1, 2; 1, 5; 3, 1 (the eight forms of marriage).

[164] Edition: W. CALAND, The Kāṭhaka-Gṛhyasūtra with extracts from three commentaries etc., Lahore 1925.

[165] Edition: PT. MADHUSUDAN KAUL SHASTRI, The Laugākṣi-Gṛhya-Sūtras with the *bhāṣyam* of Devapāla, 2 vol., Bombay 1928—1934. Cf. RENOU, in JA 236, p. 128.

[166] Other names are Caraka-Gṛhyasūtra and Cārāyaṇīya-Gṛhyasūtra; cf. GONDA, V. L., p. 326 and CALAND, Introduction to the edition, p. IV.

[167] Among them Aparārka on Yājñavalkya-Smṛti (Ānandāśrama ed.), p. 28f.

[168] From internal evidence it appears that he also composed a *śrauta* manual and a Laugākṣismṛti (see also KANE, H. Dh. ²I, p. 528).

date) in which each *sūtra* is explained separately. Brāhmaṇabala wrote a *pañcika*, a detailed treatise of the *paddhati* variety, containing ritual rules and regulations and supplementing the *sūtra* text with additional instructions from other *gṛhyasūtras* of the Black Yajurveda, *smṛtis*, *purāṇas* etc., quoting for each chapter first the complete *sūtra* text and subjoining the *mantras* to his own observations. There is, in the third place, a commentary *(bhāṣya)* on the *sūtras* and the relevant *mantras* by Devapāla, the Samantraka-Cārāyaṇīya-Gṛhyasūtra or Samantraka-Kāṭhaka-Gṛhyasūtra, in which the *sūtra* text is often preserved but elsewhere replaced by the commentary. Moreover, there are very useful so-called *ṛcakas* containing fragments of Brāhmaṇabala's *paddhati* on which they are based. The text of the *sūtra* work has not been preserved in a satisfactory way, many *sūtras* having the form of *ślokas* or being reducible to *ślokas*.

The first of the seventy-three chapters treats of the obligations and rules of conduct of the Veda student, the second of the duties with regard to the fire, the third with the student's returning home. There follow chapters on *dharma*, viz. *vratas* and penances *(kṛcchra)*,[169] on engaging in *vratas* (VIII), on the beginning of the studies of the Veda (*upākaraṇa*, IX);[170] on those who are qualified for an initiation into the study of the *upaniṣad* (X); the next chapters deal with the building and the entering of the house after the wedding; XIII with the *pākayajñas*; XIV with the election of a bride, XV and XVI with the forms of marriage called *brāhmavivāha* and the *āsuravivāha*;[171] the following chapters with the wedding ceremonies—XVIII with the removal of evil influences; XXV includes an interesting wedding song of twenty-one stanzas;[172] besides, the sacrificial rites, worship of Agni etc., feeding of brahmins etc.—; after the rites relating to conception, birth etc. the author turns to the *upanayana* (XLI) to subjoin chapters on a large variety of *vratas*, sacrifices, ceremonies for pacification of evil, welfare etc.

Structurally, the Mānava-Gṛhyasūtra,[173] the manual of the followers of the

---

[169] For *kṛcchra* see KANE, H. Dh. IV, p. 132; for the *taptakṛcchra* (VI) ibidem, p. 117; 138; 910; for the *sāṃtapana* (VII) ibidem, p. 118; 147. It may be recalled that the Viṣṇusmṛti (see J. D. M. DERRETT in this History, IV, p. 37) was according to J. JOLLY (Abh. Bayerische Akademie München, 1879, p. 22; The Institutes of Viṣṇu, S. B. E. VII, Oxford 1880 (Delhi 1965), p. IX) the ancient *dharma* book of the Cārāyaṇīya-Kāṭhakas.

[170] See KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 807.

[171] See KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 516.

[172] See CALAND, in AO 7, p. 305; LGS. 25, 20.

[173] Edition: F. KNAUER, Das Mānava-Gṛhya-Sūtra, nebst Commentar in kurzer Fassung, Petersburg 1897; RAMAKRISHNA HARSHAJI SASTRI, Mānavagṛhyasūtra of the Maitrāyaṇīya *śākhā* with the comm. of Aṣṭāvakra (with introduction, indices etc.) Baroda 1926; translation: M. J. DRESDEN, Mānavagṛhyasūtra (with a comm.), Thesis Utrecht 1941, Groningen 1941. See also P. VON BRADKE, Über das Mānava-Gṛhya-Sūtra, Thesis Leipzig 1882, ZDMG 36, p. 417 (especially on the relations between this text, the MŚS. and the MDhŚ.); CALAND, in GGA 1898, p. 60; in ZDMG 51, p. 130.

Maitrāyaṇīyas—hence the other title Maitrāyaṇīya(-Mānava)-Gṛhyasūtra[174]—is closely related to the Kāṭhaka work;[175] in a large number of passages it runs parallel also to Vārāha's text. Among the interesting correspondences are the *śāntikarma* (2, 1: cf. KāṭhGS. 45) i.e. the damping of the fire for averting its evil influence, a rite which forms part of the ceremonial for the deceased[176] and a rare rite called *ṣāḍāhutam* "(the rite of) the six oblations" in MGS. 2, 18 and *putreṣṭi* in KaṭhGS. 48 which is to be performed by a person who longs for sons. The Vināyaka rite[177] which runs nearly parallel to Yājñavalkyasmṛti 1, 270–292[178] does not however occur in the Kāṭhaka text. The main representatives of this school have been the Moḍha(ka) brahmins who, residing in the regions between Gujarat and Benares, were active ritualists far into the 16th century.[179] The texts of the *sūtra* and of Aṣṭāvakra's (±1425 A.D.)[180] commentary have however been imperfectly preserved. The language of the *sūtra* text sometimes deviates from the norm; some passages are stylistically similar to the Śrautasūtra of the Mānavas.[181] The work contains some uncommon *mantras* which are supposed to have been borrowed from other traditions.[182]

The comparatively brief (17 sections) Vārāha-Gṛhyasūtra,[183] the other domestic manual of the Maitrāyaṇīyas,[184] is very closely related to the *sūtra* of the Mānavas. Both works and the Kāṭhaka as the third have so much in common that at least parts of their contents seem to be based on the same tradition and can even pass for recensions of the same original.[185] All three works are no doubt comparatively late.[186] The compiler who—uncommonly and contrary to

[174] On the title of the manual see KNAUER, op. cit., p. XLV, according to whom Maitrayaṇīya is the older, Mānava (after Maitrayaṇīya-Mānava) the younger name.

[175] There are some deviations in the order of arrangement: the *vastukarma* (KāṭhGS. 11: MGS. 2, 11), the *pākayajñas* (13: 2, 2), the *putreṣṭi* (48: 2, 18), the *baliharaṇa* (54: 2, 12).

[176] CALAND, Bestattungsgebräuche, p. 113. Cf. also KauśS. 69, 1–72, 18.

[177] See DRESDEN, op. cit., p. 157 (with a bibliographical note); GONDA, R. I. I, p. 262.

[178] See v. BRADKE, in ZDMG 36, p. 426.

[179] See J. U. YAJNIK, in JBoBRAS 10, p. 93; KNAUER, op. cit., p. XXI; BÜHLER, in S. B. E. XXV, p. XLV.

[180] See KNAUER, op. cit., p. XXI.

[181] See v. BRADKE, op. cit., p. 450.

[182] Hāridravika or Kālāpaka? (RENOU, Écoles, p. 190).

[183] Editions: R. SAMA SASTRY, Vārāhagṛhyasūtra, Baroda 1921; RAGHU VIRA (with brief extracts from the Paddhatis of Gaṅgādhara and Vasiṣṭha and an Appendix on the corresponding passages in VGS. (Sama Sastry) and MGS.), Thesis Utrecht 1929; Lahore 1932; P. ROLLAND, Un rituel domestique védique. Le Vārāhagṛhyasūtra (with a French translation, introduction, and notes referring inter alia to Indo-European and anthropological parallels), Aix-en-Provence 1971.

[184] This does not only appear from the Maitrāyaṇīya *mantras* quoted *pratīkena* but also from explicit references in 1, 1 and 9, 1.

[185] See also RAGHU VIRA, op. cit., Introduction, p. 16; RENOU, in JA 1939, p. 633; and the synopsis in ROLLAND, op. cit., p. 191; also p. 28; 36.

[186] VGS. 6, 32 alludes to the Mīmāṃsā; 6, 22 and 9, 19 attest to respect for the cow; for a discussion see ROLLAND, op. cit., p. 34.

the authors of the two other *sūtras*—begins with the birth rites—the enumeration of the *pariśiṣṭas*[187] in 1, 1 is probably an interpolation—confines himself mainly to the *saṃskāras*, among these especially to the marriage ceremonies (sections 10–15). He includes however also passages on the study of the Veda,[188] viz., after the *upanayana* in 5, on the observances (*vrata*, 6 and 7), on the beginning, interruptions and termination of the study (8), on *samāvartana*, *snātaka* etc. (9). The *saṃskāras* dealt with last are the rites of conception and pregnancy (16). The final section, entitled "(sacrifice) to all the gods" *(vaiśvadevam)* but actually dealing with the sacrifice to the gods (in general: *devayajña*) and the *bali* offerings may be a later addition. Like the compilers of other domestic manuals the author has in some places inserted material that is foreign to its context;[189] the respectful reception of a guest is here also (in 11) dealt with when the arrival of the bridegroom comes up in the discussion.

Although the traditional number of the important *pariśiṣṭas* is twenty-two, the list in the Gṛhyasūtra 1, 1 mentions twenty-seven of them.[190] In spite of their being mainly concerned with *śrauta* subjects,[191] part of them have been incorporated in the domestic tradition.[192] Some of these paralipomena are no doubt rather old; some are almost identical with certain sections of the Mānava-Śrautasūtra.

The Pāraskara-Gṛhyasūtra[193] (sometimes Kātīya-Gṛhyasūtra),[194] ascribed to an author of the same name—which however is not found in the Veda—belongs

---

[187] See chapter II, 5, n. 112 above.

[188] See ROLLAND, op. cit., p. 25.

[189] See VGS. 3, 13f.

[190] Enumerated by ROLLAND, op. cit., p. 53. See also RENOU, Écoles, p. 182.

[191] The numbers 5–7 treat of *śulba* matter.

[192] Three *pariśiṣṭas* have been edited by RAGHU VIRA, the Cāturhotṛka (9, with a translation) in JVS 2, 1, p. 91; the Gonāmika, a cattle rite (10) in JVS 1, p. 1; the Chando'nukramaṇī, an index of chants (23) in JRAS 64 (1932), p. 547, and two by ROLLAND (with French translations), the Vṛṣotsarga (15) and the Rahasya, a *vrata* preparatory to the *pravargya* rite (12) in JA 257 (1969), p. 266; in Un fragment médical védique, in MSS 30 (1972), p. 129 Rolland edited and translated section I of the Bhūtotpatti-Pariśiṣṭa (on embryology and anatomy). See also KASHIKAR, S. Ś., p. 112 and ROLLAND, Deux pariśiṣṭa de l'école vārāha, in JA 257, p. 265.

[193] Edited (with a partly antiquated German translation) by A. F. STENZLER, Indische Hausregeln, II, 2 parts (Abh. K. M. VI, 2 and 4), Leipzig 1876–1878; (with the *bhāṣya* of Harihara) by LĀDHĀRĀMA ŚARMAN, Bombay 1889; (with a Hindi translation) by RĀJĀRĀMA, Lahore 1909; by GOPĪNĀTHA KARA, Cuttack 1915; (with five commentaries) by M. G. BĀKRE, Bombay 1917; Pāraskara-Gṛhyasūtra, with Kātyāyana's *śrāddha*, *śauca*, *snāna*, *bhojanakalpasūtra* ed. by GOPĀLA ŚĀSTRĪ, Benares 1920; with two commentaries, notes etc. by G. Ś. NENE, Benares 1925; ed. SH. S. PATHAK, Poona 1930; Engl. translation by H. OLDENBERG, in S. B. E. XXIX, p. 263. See also A. F. STENZLER, in ZDMG 7 (1853), p. 527; and in Glückwunsch . . . Fr. A. v. Humboldt, Breslau 1855.

[194] Cf. WEBER, I. L., ²p. 158. HILLEBRANDT, Rit., p. 27 wrongly mentions a Kātyāyana-Gṛhysūtra (see CALAND, in Museum 4, p. 251). For the Chāndogya-Pariśiṣṭa ("alias Katyāyana-Smṛti") see R. C. HAZRA, in NIA 7 (1944), p. 61.

to the Mādhyaṃdina recension[195] of the White Yajurveda. In view of the large number of commentaries[196]—among them one by Karka (earlier than 1100 A.D.), one by Harihara (earlier than 1250), one by Jayarāma, one by Gadādhara (ca. 1500), and one by Rāmakṛṣṇa of the Bhāradvāja family (ca. 1750)—it must have enjoyed considerable popularity. And, indeed, of the eleven domestic manuals of the Yajurveda it is the most favourite.[197] It is well structured, well balanced and written in a lucid style. The initial chapters are really introductory: the preparation of the sacrificial ground, the getting ready of the sacrificial spoon, butter and fire (1, 1); the sacred domestic *(āvasathya)* fire, set up at the time of the householder's wedding (1, 2); the reception of a respected guest (1, 3); the general division of *gṛhya* sacrifices (1, 4, 1); the occasions on which it is established (1, 4, 2ff.) then follow the *saṃskāras:* marriage (1, 4, 5—1, 10); the first cohabitation (1, 11); the rites of pregnancy, birth and childhood (1, 12—1, 19); the tonsure of the child's head (*cūḍākaraṇa*, 2, 1); *upanayana* and Veda study (2, 2—5); the bath of the youth after finishing his studies etc. (2, 6); the rules of conduct for a *snātaka* (2, 7f.); next, the five 'great sacrifices' obligatory on the householder (*mahāyajñāḥ*, 2, 9);[198] three supplementary chapters on the study of the Veda, viz. the opening of the annual course of study; interruption and conclusion of the study (2, 10—12); various domestic rites incumbent upon the householder, such as that of *jyeṣṭhā* in connexion with ploughing, (2, 13) and others to be performed on fixed days (2, 14—16); the sacrifice to Sītā (Furrow, 2, 17); the rites connected with the first fruits (3, 1); the *āgrahāyaṇī* (3, 2); the *aṣṭakās* (3, 3); the building of a house etc. (3, 4f.) and a number of rites to be executed for special purposes (a cure for headache; preventing a servant from running away); the *śūlagava* (3, 8); the *vṛṣotsarga* (3, 9); water libations for deceased persons (3, 10); what to do when an animal is sacrificed (3, 11); the penance for a student who has broken the vow of chastity (3, 12); entering the *sabhā* (hall, assembly, 3, 13); mounting a chariot and an elephant (3, 14f.); the final section teaches how to prevent one from forgetting the texts studied.

The natural order of the subjects is hardly interrupted. The treatment of some topics, for instance the marriage rites, is comparatively succinct, some episodes being omitted. Whereas there is no section on the *śrāddha*,[199] much attention has been paid to various occasional ceremonies. Some of these may belong to the class that was not generally adopted, but none seems to be a later

---

[195] The Mādhyaṃdina-Gṛhyasūtra quoted in the commentary on ŚGS. (WEBER, I. S. XV, p. 134) is probably Pāraskara's manual.

[196] For commentaries (and their editions, if there are any) see KANE, H. Dh. I, [1]p. 530; [2]p. 1062; WEBER, l. cit.

[197] See also SEHGAL, Ś. G. S., p. 53.

[198] Cf. the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa quoted below.

[199] Hemādri quotes a *śrāddhakalpa* of the Vājasaneyins that seems to have been known as Nigama (see CALAND, Ahnenkult, p. 134). Another Mādhyaṃdina *śrāddha* text, regarded as a *pariśiṣṭa*, is attributed to Kātyāyana; it resembles that of Gobhila very much.

addition[200] although 3, 10 and 12 run parallel with passages in *dharma* books.[201] There are many indications of a close connexion with the Kātyāyana-Śrautasūtra to which there are unmistakable references ("in the way stated above", "in the way prescribed").[202]

Some fragments have been preserved of a Baijavāpa-Gṛhyasūtra.[203] The Caraṇavyūha mentions the Baijavāpas as one of the divisions of the White Yajurveda.[204] References to the Kalpasūtra of this school are made by Bhaṭṭa Kumārila (8th cent.)[205] and Pitṛbhūti (probably 9th cent.), and its Gṛhyasūtra is extensively quoted by several authors between the 11th and 16th centuries, among them Aparārka (first half of the 12th century).[206]

There are a few references[207] to a Śāṇḍilya-Gṛhyasūtra. Had it anything to do with the famous authority of that name?

The Āśvalāyana-Gṛhyasūtra[208] begins with a transitional *sūtra* which is to underline the unity of the corpus of its school and the continuity of the expositions, intimating moreover that the technical terms already mentioned in the Śrautasūtra can be applied also in what follows. Nevertheless, the relation of this and the Śāṅkhāyana-Gṛhyasūtra to the *śrauta* works of their schools is less distinct than that which exists between both parts of the yajurvedic *kalpa*

---

[200] However, H. H. Dhruva, in JBoBRAS 19 (1895), p. 24 admitted the possibility of interpolations.

[201] For 3, 10: Manu-Smṛti 5, 68; 73; 59; 75f.; Yājñ. 3, 1ff.; 7; 12ff.; 16ff.; 21; for 3, 12, 1ff.: Manu-Smṛti 11, 119f.; Yājñ. 3, 280; ĀpDhS. 1, 26, 8, but see also TĀ. 2, 18.

[202] Cf. PGS. 1, 18, 1: KŚS. 4, 12, 22f. (for the *mantras*: VS. 3, 41; 43); PGS. 2, 2, 13: KŚS. 7, 4, 1ff. (for the quotation: ŚB. 11, 3, 3, 2); PGS. 2, 5, 41: KŚS. 25, 1, 12f. etc.; PGS. 2, 1, 10 is identical with KŚS. 5, 2, 15; for PGS. 2, 1, 9 cf. KŚS. 5, 2, 14; for PGS. 2, 1, 11: KŚS. 5, 2, 17; PGS. 2, 5, 43: KŚS. 22, 4, 28; PGS. 2, 6, 20: KŚS. 7, 2, 18 etc. For PGS. 1, 16, 11ff. compare ŚB(M). 11, 8, 3, 6; for 2, 3, 1ff. ŚB. 11, 5, 4, 6ff. and so on. Curiously enough VSK. is at PGS. 1, 3, 16f. quoted *pratīkena*. See also Renou, Écoles, p. 190.

[203] See Bhagavad Datta, Baijavāpa-Gṛhyasūtra-Saṃkalanam. Fragments of the BaijGS., 4 AIOC, Summary of papers, p. 8, n° 5, Allahabad 1926.

[204] Cf. Gonda, V. L., p. 324. A teacher Baijavāpāyana occurs at BĀU. 2, 6, 2.

[205] Kumārila, Tantravārttika 1, 3, 10; see also Kashikar, S. Ś., p. 72.

[206] Cf. also Kane, H. Dh. II, p. 198; 219; 244; 459.

[207] Rudradatta, on ĀpŚS. 9, 11, 21; Ānanda-Saṃhitā, quoted by Caland, Sacred books of the Vaikhānasas, p. 8. For Śāṇḍilya see Gonda, V. L., p. 353.

[208] Editions: A. F. Stenzler, Gṛhyasūtrāṇi. Indische Hausregeln, Sanskrit und Deutsch herausgegeben, I. Āśvalāyana, I Text, Leipzig 1864; II Übersetzung, Leipzig 1865 (AKM 3, 4; 4, 1); R. Vidyāratna and A. Vedāntavāgīśa, The Gṛhya-Sūtra of Āśvalāyana with the commentary of Gārgya Nārāyaṇa, Calcutta 1866—1869 (B.I.); an edition with the commentary of Gārgya Nārāyaṇa, the Gṛhyapariśiṣṭam and the Gṛhyakārikās, Bombay 1895, ²1909 by Bh. Sukthankar; with a Marathi translation by N. Y. Takle, Bombay 1908, 2nd edition by M. G. Bākre, Bombay 1915; with the commentary of Haradattācārya by T. Ganapati Sastri, Trivandrum 1923 (TSS 78); an edition with the Gṛhyapariśiṣṭa by Nārāyaṇa and the Kārikās by Bhaṭṭa Kumārila, Poona 1937; by Ravi Tirtha, Adyar-Madras 1944. See also V. M. Apte, in NIA 3, p. 49. English translation by H. Oldenberg, in S. B. E. XXIX, p. 151.

works. This manual is among the ritual *sūtras* unique in that it has been handed down in two recensions that in many places are strikingly different, one represented by northern manuscripts and one preserved in Malabar.[209] In contradistinction to the northern recension the southern begins with verses in which, among other things, homage is paid to the goddess Sarasvatī as well as to Śaunaka and the other *gurus*. This recension is accompanied by a very prolix[210] commentary composed by Devasvāmin. As to the contents of the other recension—which has been commented upon by Nārāyaṇa[211]—at 3, 1, 1–4, enjoining that the five *mahāyajñas*[212]—the five great sacrifices to the gods, Fathers, beings, men, and *brahman* (the Veda)—must be performed every day it defines them in practically the same words as TĀ. 2, 10; here Nārāyaṇa observes that this Āraṇyaka place is indeed the basis of the injunction.[213] Mention may be made also of 1, 6 dealing with the different marriage rites, a topic that other schools preferred to include in their *dharma* books;[214] of 1, 11 (the animal sacrifice); of 3, 10 on the student who wishes to be dismissed; of 4, 1–6 on disease and death of an *āhitāgni*—the following funeral rites being an exception to the rule that the domestic manuals do not treat this topic[215]—, of 3, 7, 8–10; 3, 11 and 12 mentioning rules to be observed by a man who goes out on business or on dangerous ways, the sacrifice of a person who is menaced by unknown danger and battle rites for the use of a king and his domestic priest *(purohita)*. The rules applying to a king who puts on his armour before battle (3, 12, *rājasaṃnahana*) is a peculiar feature of the Āśvalāyana school. In a hypercritical article Apte[216] at the time tried to demonstrate the spuriousness of many *sūtras* contained in this work which are not found in the Āśvalāyana-Mantra-Saṃhitā and in his opinion show "unusual features of citation".[217]

---

[209] C. KUNHAN RAJA, The Āśvalāyana-Gṛhyasūtra-Bhāṣya of Devasvāmin, ALB 2 (1938), p. 107. An edition (serially with the *bhāṣya*) was undertaken by C. KUNHAN RAJA and Sw. RAVI TIRTHA in ALB 1 etc., an English translation of the text and both commentaries by A. N. KRISHNA AIYANGAR in ALB 2 etc. (serially).

[210] Sometimes a *sūtra* is literally repeated in the commentary; or a *sūtra* being quoted is elucidated; there are many superfluous explanations; the opposite of a rule formulated in the *sūtra* is censured.

[211] See STENZLER, op. cit., II, p. II.

[212] See e.g. ŚB. 11, 5, 6; GONDA, R. I. I, p. 125. For the *baliharaṇa* as described in ĀśvGS. 1, 2, 3–10 and other *sūtra* works see H. CH. PATYAL, in CASS A 28 (1968), p. 61.

[213] KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 697, n. 1666 draws attention to Parāśaramādhavīya (an authority on modern Indian law: KANE, H. Dh. I², p. 779) 1, 1, p. 11 generalizing that all *smṛti* rules were known from the *śruti*.

[214] Cf. VāsDhŚ. 1, 28ff.; ĀpDhS. 2, 5, 11, 17ff.; BaudhDhŚ. 1, 11, 20, 2ff.; VisnuSm. 24, 17ff.

[215] The relevant sections have not primarily in view the ordinary householder who is usually the subject of the expositions of the *gṛhya* manuals. See also BATAKRISHNA GHOSH, in IC 8, p. 233.

[216] V. M. APTE, Textual criticism of the Āśvalāyana-Gṛhyasūtra, BDCRI 1 (1940), p. 394.

[217] Among these places are ĀśvGS. 1, 1, 4; 1, 23, 6 (but see the whole section 1, 23); 2, 6, 5; 3, 7, 8 and 9; 4, 6, 7.

Although such points should of course be noticed, one must make allowance for individual peculiarities of the 'author' and take account of the possibility that the text was at an early date remodelled and somewhat expanded in the school of the original compiler.

Although the title implies that it is a collection of paralipomena to the Gṛhyasūtra alone, the Āśvalāyana-Gṛhyapariśiṣṭa[218]—of uncertain authorship—is a supplement (of thirty sections) to the *gṛhya* as well as the *śrauta* texts of this school. It treats of sacrifices and domestic rites—mainly in connexion with *śrāddhas*, funeral ceremonies, the sacred fire, marriage, conception etc.—that are either omitted or left unexplained in the main works. Among these are some marriage customs, details concerning *śrāddhas*, rites connected with the study of the Veda, offerings to the planets, the consecration of a pond, expiation rites etc. This work, which is written partly in verse, partly in prose, is of importance because it informs us of the additions to the ritual that were considered necessary by later authorities. The earliest reference to it seems to be in Gārgya Nārāyaṇa's commentary on the Āśvalāyana-Śrautasūtra (long before 1100 A.D.).[219] Another *sūtra* work of the same name,[220] likewise by an anonymous author, and more extensive—about three times longer than the Gṛhyasūtra—deals circumstantially with almost all the subjects mentioned in the latter, adding many other topics. In fact it is a *prayoga* or *paddhati* rather than a *pariśiṣṭa*; as such it must have been useful notwithstanding its no doubt comparatively late origin.

Hemādri seems to have known a Śaunaka-Gṛhyasūtra[221] which in all probability was practically identical with Āśvalāyana's.[222]

Like Āśvalāyana, the reputed author of the other ṛgvedic *gṛhyasūtra*[223] Suyajña of the Śāṅkhāyana family, gives evidence of his affiliation, not only by the citation of numerous *mantras* from the Ṛgveda,[224] but also by the inser-

[218] Edition: K. Parameswara Aithal, Āśvalāyanagṛhyapariśiṣṭa, Adyar-Madras 1964; see also n. 208 above. In some manuscripts it is regarded as chapter V of the Gṛhyasūtra.

[219] See Aithal, op. cit. (edition), p. 6.

[220] Published in the following editions of the Gṛhyasūtra: Calcutta 1869; Bombay 1895; Poona 1937. See Aithal, op. cit., p. 16.

[221] On Śaunaka and Āśvalāyana see ch. I, section 2.

[222] Cf. A. F. Stenzler, in Weber, I. S. I, p. 243; Caland, Ahnenkult, p. 143; Renou, Écoles, p. 43. Fragments of this Śaunaka-Gṛhyasūtra were collected by T. R. Chintamani, in 8 AIOC, Mysore 1935 (not found in all copies ?).

[223] Editions: H. Oldenberg, in Weber, I. S. XV, p. 1 (with a German translation and notes); S. R. Sehgal, Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtram (with an introduction, extracts from the commentary of Nārāyaṇa and the *paddhati* of Rāmacandra, indices etc.), Delhi 1960. English translation by H. Oldenberg, in S. B. E. XXIX, p. 1. See also Pt. Vasudeva, Śāṅkhāyana-Gṛhyasaṃgraha, ed. by Somanāthopādhyāya etc., Benares 1908 ("an extreme example of editorial incompetence", Sehgal, op. cit., p. 3).

[224] According to Sehgal, op. cit., p. 37 the ĀśvGS. quotes 125, the ŚGS. 170, the KauṣGS. (see further on) 187 ṛgvedic *mantras*; there are 36 cases of parallel context.

tion of a section on the study of that Saṃhitā.[225] In contradistinction to the other work, which belongs to the Śākala *śākhā* of the Ṛgveda, it is a text of the Bāṣkala branch.[226] Although both treatises have of course much in common, Śāṅkhāyana—whose language is somewhat more archaic—includes information on some rites which are absent in the other manual: the ceremony to drive away demons when a woman is to be confined (1, 23),[227] the getting up of a mother from childbed (1, 25), the *vṛṣotsarga* (3, 11); the ceremony for averting evil *(svastyayana)* recommended to those who are to cross water (4, 14); the offerings on the full moon day of Caitra (4, 19).[228] What is of greater interest is the tendency of the longer Śāṅkhāyana text to supply facts and rules that are not found in the companion work and, more generally, the impression created by both manuals to complement each other.[229] Thus the sections on the wedding rituals include, in ŚGS. 1, 6ff., many particulars—e.g. the wooers sent to the girl's father, the washing of the bride, the dance of four or eight women, the bridegroom's going to the girl's house and offering a garment etc., the *argha* ceremony at the wedding—which are left unmentioned in Āśvalāyana's work where however more attention is paid to the election of the bride (ĀśvGS. 1, 5) and, as already observed, the different marriage rites are enumerated. Though running in the main parallel the sections on the *caula* (ŚGS. 1, 28; ĀśvGS. 1, 17) furnish the reader with various different particulars. The rules of conduct prescribed to a *snātaka* are much more elaborately treated in ŚGS. 4, 11 and 12 than in ĀśvGS. 3, 9, 6. There is considerable difference between the *śrāvaṇa* sacrifice to the serpents in ŚGS. 4, 15 and the corresponding ritual in ĀśvGS. 2, 1. The chapters V—dealing with a journey, consecration of ponds or gardens, portents, diseases—and VI—the study of the Āraṇyaka—of Śāṅkhāyana's manual are no doubt later additions[230] the former being called a *pariśiṣṭa* in a *kārikā* quoted by the commentator Nārāyaṇa.

A southern text, designated at the end of the single chapters as Kauṣītaka-Gṛhya[231] and therefore professing to follow the same ṛgvedic tradition, is in a metrical commentary attributed to Śāmbavya.[232] This work—which contains nothing of the last two chapters and only part of the rites described in ŚGS.

---

[225] ŚGS. 2, 7; see ĀśvGS. 1, 22, 12ff.

[226] Cf. ĀśvGS. 3, 5, 8 quoting the last stanza of the Śākala text and ŚGS. 4, 5, 9 where the last stanza of the Bāṣkala school is quoted (see also OLDENBERG's note in S. B. E. XXIX, p. 113).

[227] On the conception rite 1, 19, 4 see CALAND, in ZDMG 51, p. 133.

[228] See KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 820; cf. VaikhSmS. 4, 8.

[229] On the Kauṣītaki-Brāhmaṇa as a sort of expanded supplement of the Aitareya see GONDA, V. L., p. 347.

[230] See OLDENBERG, in S. B. E. XXIX, p. 9.

[231] Edition: T. R. CHINTAMANI, Madras 1944 (very undependable; wrongly regarded as a Kauṣītaki-Sūtra; see also SEHGAL, op, cit., p. 4; 18).

[232] On Śāmbavya see OLDENBERG, in WEBER, I. S. XV, p. 154; MACDONELL, H. S. L., p. 251. The name occurs in a corrupt form (Śāṃvatya) at ĀśvGS. 4, 8, 26. The Ānanda-Saṃhitā, ch. VI mentions a Śāmbavīyasūtra which may be the identical text.

III and IV—differs in certain details from Śāṅkhāyana,[233] and includes inter alia the piercing of the lobes of a child's ear *(karṇavedha)*[234] (1, 20, 1–8) which is wanting in the other *gṛhyasūtras* of the Ṛgveda and (in chapter V) rites concerning the *pretas* (the departed spirits for whom the obsequial rites have not yet been performed).[235] Yet it has very much in common with the Śāṅkhāyana-Sūtra which it sometimes repeats verbatim, enabling the interpreters of the companion manual to emend some corrupt places.[236]

The question has been discussed[237] as to whether the occurrence of some *ślokas* in both Śāṅkhāyana and Kauṣītaka as well as a close correspondence between some places in the former and the Manusmṛti[238] and a reference to Manu in ŚGS. 2, 16, 1[239] can furnish reliable information on the relative chronology of these works. The probabilities are however in favour of the supposition that the *ślokas*[240]—which are found invariably at the end of sections without disturbing the order of the ritual rules—are later additions; that Śāṅkhāyana quoted from floating sayings ascribed to Manu and, like the Manusmṛti, reproduced rules of conduct that are also mentioned in other works and may in certain formulations have belonged to widespread oral traditions. The chronological relations remain uncertain.

The domestic manual of the sāmavedic Jaiminīyas is the comparatively brief Jaiminīya-Gṛhyasūtra[241] which is in many respects closely related to Gobhila's *sūtra* work. However, the author evinces a certain independence, not only of the authorities of his own school but also of any *gṛhya* tradition. The number of *mantras* quoted is very large; only part of them are found in the Mantrabrāhmaṇa and those that occur there show variation, agreeing sometimes more closely with yajurvedic recensions. They are moreover quoted com-

---

[233] For particulars see SEHGAL, op. cit., p. 40; 48.

[234] See KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 254.

[235] See KANE, H. Dh. IV, p. 262.

[236] BHAGAVAD DATTA, Vaidika vāṅmaya kā itihāsa, I, Lahore 1935, p. 129 supposed an Aitareya-Gṛhyasūtra to have existed formerly (RENOU, Écoles, p. 44).

[237] See G. BÜHLER, in The Laws of Manu translated, Oxford 1886 (S. B. E. XXV), p. XXXV (ŚGS. may have drawn on the original of 'Manu'); R. GOPAL, I. V. K., p. 69 and in PO 27 (1962), p. 39 (suggests that the author of the Manusmṛti was probably a follower of the Śāṅkhāyana *śākhā*; compare also KANE, H. Dh. I, [1]p. 80; [2]p. 143.

[238] E.g. Manu 2, 108: ŚGS. 2, 6, 8; 3, 92: 2, 14, 22; 3, 94: 2, 14, 19f.; 3, 100: 2, 17, 1; 3, 103: 2, 16, 3; 3, 114: 2, 14, 21.

[239] Cf. Manu 5, 41.

[240] As to ŚGS. see 1, 1, 15; 1, 2, 5ff.; 1, 10, 7ff. (expatiating on 1, 5, 1); 2, 13, 8; 4, 5, 15; 4, 7, 55; the sections 2, 16 and 17 digressing on the reception of guests are entirely in *ślokas*.

[241] W. CALAND, De literatuur van den Sāmaveda en het Jaiminigṛhyasūtra (introduction, text, extracts from the comm. Subodhinī by Śrīnivāsādhvari etc.), Amsterdam Acad. 1905; CALAND, The Jaiminigṛhyasūtra (introduction, text, Engl. translation etc.), Lahore 1922; edited by K. RAṄGĀCĀRYA (with the same comm.), Madras 1898.

pletely *(sakalapāṭhena)*.[242] These *mantras* were obvioulsy neither selected from the Mantrabrāhmaṇa nor from a special Jaiminīya collection. This work consists of two chapters, the first dealing mainly with the *saṃskāras*, the second with *śrāddha*, *aṣṭakās*, funeral ceremonies and *śānti* rites. The last four sections of chapter II seem to have borrowed from the Baudhāyanīyas whose school was very popular in the South: section 6, a rite to be performed by a man who wishes that his house will be in a flourishing state (BGŚS. 1, 18); the neutralization of prodigies (7: BGS. 3, 6); the recitation of the Veda during a fast (8: BDhS. 3, 9); and the appeasing of the planets (9, partly in verse: BGŚS. 1, 16). As to the style, there is a curious alternation of concise, even allusive passages and prolix formulations.[243]

Whereas according to Mahīdāsa's commentary on the Caraṇavyūha (16th century)[244] the Rāṇāyaṇīyas belonged to the region of the Marāthās and the Jaiminīyas to Karṇāṭaka, the Kauthumins are said to be resident in Gujarāt. Among the texts left by the last school, which in fact was also found in other regions, including the South,[245] is the very incomplete Kauthuma-Gṛhya[246]—there are only twenty-one sections, even a section on the marriage ritual is wanting—that has been handed down in one manuscript—discovered in the South—in which the text is often corrupt, abbreviated and disjoined; there are also grammatical irregularities. However, due to regional variations in their domestic rites the Kauthumins must have produced also other domestic manuals, one of which, that composed by Gobhila—which prevails in the East—came in course of time to supersede the Kauthuma-Gṛhyasūtra,[247] of which the Kauthuma-Gṛhya seems to be a comparatively late and probably abbreviated recast.[248] The treatment of many ceremonies is defective, but the work does include some topics that are only rarely mentioned: the *arkakanyādāna* which is to ward off the evil consequences of a third marriage, and a ceremony performed after menstruation to facilitate conception.[249]

The Gobhila-Gṛhyasūtra[250]—divided into four chapters *(prapāṭhaka)*[251]—is

---

[242] For details see CALAND, J. G. S. ed. 1922, p. XI; see also SŪRYAKĀNTA, Kauthuma-Gṛhya, Lahore 1943; Calcutta 1956, p. 40.

[243] For a Śāṭyāyanasūtra dealing with the expiations of the domestic ritual see GONDA, V. L., p. 349, n. 45.

[244] See GONDA, V. L., p. 337.

[245] Cf. also RENOU, Écoles, p. 118; 128; PARPOLA, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 41.

[246] Edited (with a long introduction) by SŪRYAKĀNTA (see n. 242 above).

[247] For information given by the author of the Gobhila-Gṛhyakarmaprakāśikā (who was a follower of Gobhila and does not mention the text under discussion) see SŪRYAKĀNTA, op. cit., p. 1.

[248] The text edited by Sūryakānta calls itself Kauthuma-Gṛhya and refers to the opinion of Kuthuma (2: 6, 10).

[249] Section 6, p. 11; cf. BGŚS. 5, 5; section 7.

[250] Edition and German translation by F. KNAUER, Das Gobhilagṛhyasūtra, 2 vol., Dorpat and Leipzig 1884, Dorpat 1886; also edited by M. CHANDRA KĀNTA TARKĀLAṄKĀRA (with a comm. by the editor), Calcutta 1871—1879 (²1907—1908) and (with a Sanskrit comm. and Hindi translation) by P. S. SAMASHRAMI, Madhura-

one of the few domestic manuals of the Sāmavedins. It presupposes, not only the Pūrvārcika of the Kauthuma-Saṃhitā of the Sāmaveda but also a special collection of *mantras*, the Mantrabrāhmaṇa composed for the use of those who would perform the domestic rites.[252] Although Gobhila's manual corresponds to the Lāṭyāyana-Śrautasūtra it is a wholly independent work, which seems to have been used by both Kauthumas and Rānāyaṇīyas.[253] Being of comparatively late origin[254] it is systematic, comprehensive and methodically arranged. It contains a section (in 4, 2ff.) on the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*.[255] Caland[256] at the time recorded a large number of passages that are common to the Jaiminīya- and Gobhila-Sūtras. Although he was inclined to explain "this agreement" by the hypothesis of the existence of "a common stock of ritual precepts", the probabilities seem to be in favour of the supposition that Gobhila has used and in many places copied Jaimini.[257] The *sūtrakāra* quotes several sāmavedic authorities[258] and—like other authors of the later period—keeps closer to the Saṃhitā than to his Brāhmaṇa. There are commentaries by Nārāyaṇa and Tarkālaṅkāra.[259]

Mention must also be made of the Gṛhyasaṃgrahapariśiṣṭa ascribed to Gobhilaputra.[260] Consisting of two chapters *(prapāṭhaka)* of 114 and 95 *ślokas*, this metrical compendium is no doubt of much later date than the Gṛhyasūtra, although it may belong to the older *pariśiṣṭas*. The attribution to Gobhila's son

---

pur 1906; by Ch. Bhattacharya (with the comm. of Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa), Calcutta 1936; by M. B. Jha (with a Sanskrit comm. by the editor), Benares 1936; Engl. translation by H. Oldenberg, in S. B. E. XXX, p. 3; by V. Vedantatirtha, Calcutta 1941.

[251] The text has preserved traces of a different division: at the end of six sections (1, 4, 31; 3, 6, 15; 4, 1, 22; 4, 4, 34; 4, 5, 34; 4, 6, 15) the last words of certain *sūtras* are repeated, a well-known method of indicating the close of a chapter.

[252] See the preceding section.

[253] Parpola, in Vol. Raghu Vira, p. 73.

[254] Basing himself on the fact that in the Vaṃśa-Brāhmaṇa (see Gonda, V. L., p. 320) fourteen names of teachers follow on that of Gobhila, Parpola, in Vol. Raghu Vira, p. 73 arrives at the conclusion that Drāhyāyaṇa is about 300 or 350 years later than Gobhila; but is the list of names reliable?

[255] Cf. Caland, Ahnenkult, p. 110.

[256] Caland, Literatuur van den Sāmaveda, p. 11.

[257] Parpola, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 70 who draws special attention to the term *vrātika* (JGS. 1, 16; GGS. 3, 1, 28; cf. Caland, Literatuur van den Sāmaveda, p. 8) for the observances *(vrata)* introducing the study of the *āraṇyaka* in both schools, which is proper only with regard to Jaiminīya, and to the *vratas* as composed with the arrangement of the *āraṇyagānas*: it appears that the Jaim. Ār. G. is the text for which the *aupaniṣadaṃ vrata* is required.

[258] Knauer, G. G. S. II, p. 55.

[259] I refer to Knauer, G. G. S. II, p. 14.

[260] Text, German translation, introduction and notes: M. Bloomfield, in ZDMG 35 (1881), p. 533; the text has also been edited in Tarkālaṃkāra's Gobhilīya Gṛhya Sūtra (appendix, and a 2nd edition separately Calcutta 1910). Cf. Bloomfield, in the J. Hopkins University Circular, May 1882, p. 205; K. S. Shukla, in 26 AIOC, Summary of Papers, p. 379. For the title see N. C. C. VI, p. 109.

is honorific, the work being held in respect. The text consists of two distinct parts: 1, 1–33 deals with the ritual fire, and especially with its names. The commentators—among them Dīkṣitarāmakṛṣṇa—are right in considering it—that is, more precisely, the rest from 1, 33—not only a supplement to Gobhila's Gṛhyasūtra but also a collection of motivations and explanations of technical terms. Some *sūtras* of Gobhila's manual are explained, others amplified,[261] but with respect to that text no definite order is followed. Pieces of advice are not wanting, e.g. 2, 92 "One should never perform acts prescribed in schools other than one's own".[262] The addenda are moreover of the character of the so-called *vidhāna* literature[263] which teaches the 'magical' or automatic effects of ritual acts and in this case also of infractions of ritual rules which are said to cause disease, misfortune or death.[264] Ancient tradition is however not completely absent.[265] The author has occasionally drawn on other domestic *sūtras*[266] and deals so often with ritual generalities—part of them valuable—that there is something to be said for the supposition that his work was only secondarily adopted by the Kauthumins.[267]

This work is closely associated with the more important and probably later Karmapradīpa,[268] a *pariśiṣṭa* belonging to Gobhila's *sūtra*. Since the authors of both works compiled the same subject-matter it is not surprising that their works should have some *ślokas* in common.[269] Yet they often differ in opinion and particulars so that they probably composed their treatises to a great extent independently of each other.[270] This "Lamp of the ritual acts" is likewise one of the numerous domestic *pariśiṣṭas* and a free commentary on Gobhila's *sūtra*. The tradition which it represents belongs to the Kauthuma recension and it has been supposed to be a portion or abbreviated version of a no longer extant Kātyāyana-Smṛti. It has indeed been attributed to this authority (the great jurist) whose name is mentioned in several places and who in the opening verse is said to dilate upon some subjects which were not treated by Gobhila.[271] This attribution is, however, very uncertain.

The comparatively brief Khādira-Gṛhyasūtra[272] (divided into four *paṭalas*)

---

[261] Compare e.g. the section 1, 2—12 on the names of the ritual fire amplifying portions of GGS. 1, 1; 4; 9; 2, 1; 5—9; 3, 1.

[262] For a discussion see RENOU, Écoles, p. 17; 34.

[263] See GONDA, V. L., p. 37.

[264] Cf. e.g. 1, 48f.; 64f.; 71.

[265] Cf. e.g. 2, 19f., reminiscent of ṚV. 10, 85, 40f.

[266] There are some striking reminiscences of KŚS., e.g. 1, 82: KŚS. 1, 3, 38.

[267] Cf. KNAUER, GGS. ed. II, p. 5.

[268] Subrahmaṇya, Gobhila-Gṛhyakarmapradīpa, ed. by PURUṢOTTAMA ŚĀSTRĪ and SŪRYANĀRĀYAṆA DĪKṢITA, Benares 1905. See also KANE, H. Dh. I, ^{1}p. 219; ^{2}p. 503; KNAUER, GGS. II, p. 10.

[269] GSP. 1, 79 II, 80 I: K. 1, 7, 5; GSP. 1, 84 I: K. 2, 8, 3 I etc.

[270] As to the commentator Āśārka see BLOOMFIELD, op. cit., p. 535.

[271] Cf. GGS. 3, 6, 13.

[272] Edition: A. MAHADEVA SASTRI, L. SRINIVASACHARYA, The Khādira Gṛhya-sūtra with the commentary of Rudraskanda, Mysore 1913; also published at

is in fact a Drāhyāyaṇa-Gṛhyasūtra and constitutes a later and more concise revised version of Gobhila's manual. It is often considered to belong to the Rānayaṇīya tradition,[273] but this relation is not certain;[274] other information would point to its being a text of the Śārdūlas who are another branch of the Sāmaveda.[275] Moreover, it seems, on the strength of identified quotations, to be the same work as the Gṛhyasūtra of the Gautamas and the surmise is not wholly unwarranted that it belonged to the books of their subdivision of the Sāmaveda. Like Gobhila it quotes the *mantras* almost invariably *pratīkena*. Whereas these formulas are easily found in the Mantrabrāhmaṇa the text contains some *sūtras* that have no counterpart in Gobhila.[276] Besides, the arrangement of the *sūtras* is often different, those that belong to each other being more carefully grouped together. Digressions and explanations found in Gobhila are omitted, references less in number; in mentioning ritual facts the author confines himself to the principal points. Thus the main interest of this work lies in its being an example of how a later author would remodel the work of a predecessor in order to achieve a better arrangement and the greatest possible conciseness.

There exists also a Drāhyāyaṇa-Gṛhyapariśiṣṭasūtra, comprising two chapters *(prapāṭhaka)*, which has been under the influence of the Baudhāyana school.[277]

While strikingly deviating from the standard, the Kauśika-Sūtra,[278] which

---

Muzaffarpur 1934 (probably identical with the Drāhyāyaṇa-Gṛhyasūtra mentioned by DANDEKAR, Bibliography I, p. 57); and edited by PATTABHIRAMARYA, Madras 1955 (with a concise commentary called Sutrārthabodhinī); R. M. DIKSHITAR, Madras n.d.; the text is also added to OLDENBERG's translation in S. B. E. XXIX, p. 374. See also KNAUER, GGS. ed. II, p. 34; RENOU, Écoles, p. 120.

[273] Cf. PARPOLA, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 32 and 55; see also PARPOLA, in Vol. Raghu Vira, p. 73.

[274] See CALAND, Jaiminigṛhyasūtra, p. III: if Hemādri, Śrāddhakalpa (p. 1424; 1460; 1468) is right in calling Gobhila a *rāṇāyanīyasūtrakṛt*, the Khādira manual cannot be a text of the Rāṇāyanīyas too.

[275] CALAND, loc. cit., referring to A. V. KATHAVATE, Report on a search for Sanskrit manuscripts in the Bombay Presidency 1891—1895, Bombay 1901, no. 79.

[276] Some of them can be traced back to Drāhyāyaṇa; cf. KhGS. 1, 1, 14: DŚS. 1, 1, 3; KhGS. 1, 1, 24: DŚS. 1, 2, 21.

[277] See CALAND, P. B., p. IX; De literatuur van den Sāmaveda en het Jaiminigṛhyasūtra, Amsterdam Acad. 1905, p. 12; PARPOLA, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 33; 42; 74.

[278] Editions: M. BLOOMFIELD, The Kauśikasūtra of Atharva-Veda, with extracts from the commentaries of Dārila and Keśava (with a long introduction), in JAOS 14, separately New Haven 1890; reprint Delhi 1972 (cf. BLOOMFIELD, in Proceedings Am. Or. Soc. 1883, Oct., p. VI; also Hopkins Circular 1884 March, p. 52); U. N. SINGH, Atharvavedīya Kauśika Gṛhya Sūtra, Madhurpur 1942; H. R. DIWEKAR, V. P. LIMAYE, R. N. DANDEKAR, C. G. KASHIKAR, V. V. BHIDE, Kauśikasūtra-Dārilabhāṣya, Poona 1972; translation: W. CALAND, Altindisches Zauberritual. Probe einer Uebersetzung der wichtigsten Theile des Kauśika Sūtra (7—9, *paribhāṣās* etc.; 10—52, comprising the sections on charms), with an introduction, notes etc.; cf. CALAND, in WZKM 8, p. 367 and in ZDMG 53; 54; 56. See also HILLEBRANDT, Ritualliteratur, p. 36; KASHIKAR, S. Ś., p. 99. For Kauśika, an ancient teacher (BĀU. 2, 6, 1; 4, 6, 1), who is regarded as the author of the AV. Pariśiṣṭas, see GONDA, V.L., p. 307f.

belongs to the Atharvaveda, is one of the most important works of this class. Properly speaking, it is not a *gṛhyasūtra* in the usual sense of the term. After Bloomfield and Caland it attracted but a very limited number of scholars, no doubt on the one hand because of the character of its text which has been badly preserved and is written in a very terse and often obscure style. The *sūtra* is indeed as difficult to understand as it is valuable from various points of view. The lack of interest is on the other hand probably due to the mistaken belief that the second half (*kaṇḍikās* 53–141), which was left untranslated by Caland, is in its entirety less interesting. Roughly speaking the voluminous work—which consists of fourteen chapters *(adhyāya)*—is in fact a twofold whole, part I (sections 10–52) dealing with charms, part II comprising many *gṛhya* rites and other subject-matter. After a short introduction on the 'sources', the author treats in the sections 1–9 of the *paribhāṣās* for the *pākayajñas*,[279] the preparation of the holy water etc., and especially of the sacrifices of full and new moon which constitute so to say the framework in which the magical rites are inserted.[280]

The first part of the book is to a certain extent systematically arranged, similar charms being treated in the same sections or paragraphs.[281] In the several sections—which are not always congruous with those of the manuscripts and Caland's translation—the author has arranged his topics almost entirely in accordance with the order in which they occur in the Śaunakīya-Saṃhitā. As a whole it is comparable to the Vidhāna works of the Ṛg- and Sāmaveda,[282] though much better organized than these and—in conformity with the aspirations of the Atharvavedins—pretending to the level of the solemn rites. Thus *adhyāya* II contains rites for begetting wisdom, for obtaining a village or every desire, war and battle rites, restoration and unction of rulers; III various rites for averting misfortune or securing prosperity, ploughing rituals, cattle charms, rites relating to the division of an inheritance, to building a house, etc. as well as variations of the *vṛṣotsarga* and *āgrahāyaṇī* ceremonies; IV a large collection of remedial rites and rites in connexion with women (against abortion and sterility, for subjecting a woman, damaging rival women, philtres etc., variants of the *puṃsavana* and *garbhādhāna* rites); V charms against storm and lightning, for directing the course of a river, removing fire, imparting sexual vigour, procuring rain, warding off demons, removing obstacles in a sacrifice, against evil dreams etc.; VI 'witchcraft practices' *(ābhicārikāṇi)*; VII, sections 50–52 rites to secure welfare, safety, security for herds, stables, fields etc. These numerous prescripts together with the relevant *mantras* constitute an almost

---

[279] For particulars see above, chapter II, 4; Renou, Écoles, p. 75.

[280] For particulars see Caland, Altindisches Zauberritual, p. VI, who (p. VIII) draws also attention to the fact that the atharvavedic 'rites' are not essentially different from the so-called optional *(kāmya)* rites.

[281] For a detailed survey see Bloomfield, Edition, p. LXIV, Caland, op. cit., p. XIII.

[282] See Gonda, V. L., p. 37; 38.

unique collection of charms and incantations for the use, under various circumstances, of the Vedic Indians; of magical practices attesting to a prescientific ingenuity in solving problems, removing obstacles and smoothing away the many difficulties with which man can be confronted; attesting also to the belief in the efficacy of amulets, certain plants and other objects.[283]

Generally speaking, the texts quoted in each charm and ritual prescription from the Atharvaveda-Saṃhitā are closely connected with the actions to be done and the purpose of the rites. In many cases *mantras* and ritual acts form a harmonious whole. Thus at 36, 1–4 a method of putting to sleep the inmates of a house in order to approach a woman safely reads as follows:

> "AV. 4, 5 is (an incantation) to put to sleep. After one has sprinkled the house with a jug (filled) with water which contains the sediment (of the butter oblations that have been offered to the accompaniment of AV. 4, 5) he turns (i.e. empties) (the vessel) at the inside (or western side ?) of the door; likewise (i.e. he repeats this act) naked; he mutters (that text while gazing at) the morter (in the house), the northern corner (of the house), the right (fore)leg of the bed (of the woman) (and) the straps (of the bed)".

The text quoted, invoking in its last stanzas Sleep itself, contains statements such as "we put the people to sleep", "do thou make all the women and the dogs to sleep", "all of them we make to sleep". As to the *mantras* employed by the *sūtrakāra* they are mostly taken from the shorter hymns in AVŚ. I–VII–in general just those of the Saṃhitā; there are no differences in wording or in the number and arrangement of the stanzas. However, when a 'hymn' is evidently of a composite character, the compiler employs each part of it separately and in its proper value.[284] Like the ritual acts the *mantras* are no doubt of different antiquity.

Turning now to the second part of the book we find in the rest of chapter VII among charms and amulets for various purposes some domestic rites and ceremonies–*godāna*,[285] *cūḍākaraṇa*, *upanayana* etc.–; these sections were probably compiled because the Atharvavedins wished also in this respect to compete with the followers of the other Vedas.[286] Chapter VIII contains the interesting

[283] See V. Henry, La magie dans l'Inde antique, Paris 1904, and compare M. Bloomfield, The Atharva-Veda and the Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa, Strassburg 1899, p. 57.

[284] For instance, AV. 4, 38, 1–4 (a gambling charm) are used at Kauś. 41, 13 along with the similar texts AV. 7, 50 and 7, 109 for success in gambling; 4, 38, 5–7 occur at KauśS. 21, 11 in a cattle-charm. See Bloomfield, Edition, p. XLI.

[285] Shaving; see Kane, H. Dh. II, p. 402.

[286] B. C. Lele, Some atharvanic portions in the gṛhyasūtras, Thesis Bonn 1927 made an attempt to discover "such portions of the *gṛhyasūtras* which seem to be unmistakably atharvanic in character". The probabilities are however in favour of the supposition that as far as the domestic rites proper are concerned the Atharvavedins drew on the same more or less common traditions as the others. Lele's thesis (p. 17) that the rites originally were atharvanic in character, but in course of time modified, their atharvanic origin being forgotten or neglected is incapable of proof. As to rites other than *saṃskāras*–for instance that against sickness in ĀśvGS. 3, 6, 3f., or that by which a wife makes her husband subject in ĀpGS. 3, 9, 5ff., and the cattle rite as dealt with in KauṣGS. 3, 5, 6 (cf. Sehgal, ŚGS., ed., p. 12)–

savayajñas,[287] atharvanic sacrificial rites involving the preparation of porridge and an unction of the sacrificer with ghee or with the residue of the oblations, which is regarded as a sort of substitute for, or rather as something equivalent to, a *soma* sacrifice; in this section the author has, among other things, skilfully grafted a collection of *mantras* taken from AV. 12, 3, which is mainly concerned with ritual acts intended to guarantee the survival of the sacrificer and with the latter's ritual behaviour, upon *mantras* belonging to one of the rites under discussion; IX deals with the preparation of the domestic fire, the evening and morning oblations, the *bali* offerings and the sacrifice of the first fruits; X with marriage rites;[288] XI with funeral rites[289] and the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*; XII with the ceremonious reception of a guest; XIII with omens and portents;[290] XIV—a sort of complement to the *gṛhya* sections—with the ritual called *ājyatantra*, the *aṣṭakā*, the introduction to and suspension of the study of the Veda and Indra's festival.[291] As to the *gṛhya* rites that are interspersed in the Sūtra Bloomfield[292] is probably right in supposing them to have been absorbed secondarily into its main body.

There is no tradition as to time and place of composition. What is certain is that the Sūtra presupposes the Saṃhitā. In the second place there can be no doubt that, contrary to most other cases, the Kauśika-Sūtra precedes the Vaitāna-Sūtra.[293] These texts are moreover not attributed to one and the same compiler.[294] That Kauśika—who is also credited with the authorship of the Atharvaveda-Pariśiṣṭas[295]—was generally regarded as the compiler of the work under discussion is evidenced by Keśava's introductory note and a statement of Hemādri.[296] Scholars[297] are under the impression that the Sūtra, though

---

these stand a chance of being borrowed from the atharvanic sphere, but this is not to say: from the Kauśikasūtra. Nor is the author's thesis (p. 46) "the brahmin priests thought of systematically arranging the *gṛhya* ritual when the *śrauta* sacrifices came to fall into disrepute" (compare p. 45 "the atharvanic portions in the *gṛhyasūtras* point out how the charms and superstitions of the Atharvaveda have penetrated into the priestly religion of the adherents of the three Vedas") plausible.

[287] J. Gonda, The Savayajñas (translation, introduction, commentary), Amsterdam Acad. 1965; cf. also Caland, in ZDMG 56, p. 554.

[288] E. Haas, Die Heiratsgebräuche der alten Inder nach den Gṛhyasūtra, in Weber, I. S. V, p. 267 (KauśS. ch. X and other texts).

[289] Cf. Caland, in WZKM 8, p. 367.

[290] A. Weber, Zwei vedische Texte über Omina und Portenta, Berlin Acad. 1858.

[291] J. Gonda, The Indra festival according to the Atharvavedins, in JAOS 87, p. 413 (= S. S. IV, p. 206).

[292] Bloomfield, Edition, p. XXI.

[293] Bloomfield, in JAOS 11, p. 375; Caland, in WZKM 18, p. 186; see above chapter II, 5 with note 260 and compare Renou, Écoles, p. 73.

[294] Otherwise, but unconvincingly, D. M. Bhattacharya, Materials for further study of Vaitānasūtra, OH 5, p. 13.

[295] See AVPar. 49, 4, 9, but see Gonda, V. L., p. 307 and compare Kashikar, S. Ś., p. 99.

[296] Hemādri, Caturvargacintāmaṇi, Śrāddhakalpa, p. 1229.

[297] See also Bloomfield, Edition, p. XXII.

containing much that is very old, is a comparatively late product of the Vedic literature. In its present form it is in all probability a composite whole made up of parts of different origin and authorship. For instance, in *adhyāya* XIII atharvanic *mantras* play only a secondary part in appeasing the effects of the omens and portents mentioned. The introductory *kaṇḍikā* 93 which provides the reader with a table of contents points also to the independent composition of this chapter.[298] Although he sometimes failed to reach a good result, the compiler made evident attempts at assimilating his materials. The five heterogeneous sections of the last book are very likely to represent an addition or a later stratum of the compilation.

As to the style of the work one can distinguish between the old *gṛhya* style of those sections which run parallel to the other domestic manuals (42–45 and 54f.), a more succinct and technical style of the atharvanic charms and the *pariśiṣṭa* mode of expression, broad and diffuse, in *adhyāya* XIII.[299] The most salient point which distinguishes the *gṛhya* and some other parts from the sections dealing with the atharvanic charms are the many *mantras* not derived from the Śaunakīya-Saṃhitā and therefore quoted completely.[300] Most of them are found in the Paippalāda recension.

There are two commentaries,[301] viz. the in many places corrupt Bhāṣya composed in a straightforward style by Dārila—a true *bhāṣya* writer—on the sections 1–48[302] and the better preserved Paddhati written by Keśava who is followed by the commentary ascribed to Sāyaṇa on the Saṃhitā. The explanations of these commentators differ in many respects, Keśava—who quotes Dārila and many other authorities—being not infrequently more reliable. On the other hand, Dārila—whose age and provenance are uncertain—does not only endeavour to explain the texts verbally, but makes also attempts at understanding their ritualistic significance.

According to tradition the Vaitāna- and Kauśika-Sūtras belong to the five *kalpas* (ritual manuals) attached to the Atharvaveda. The other three are the Nakṣatra-, Śānti- and Āṅgirasakalpas, which, though no more than *pariśiṣṭas*, obviously enjoyed a certain popularity.[303]

---

[298] Cf. also WEBER, op. cit., p. 345; 384; BLOOMFIELD, Edition, p. XXIV; also J. S. SPEYER, Bemerkungen zu den Gṛhyasūtra, in Bijdragen Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 1879, p. 155.

[299] Cf. BLOOMFIELD, Edition, p. XXIX.

[300] For the *mantras* of Kauś. 10–52 see my contribution to the Volume P. Aalto, Helsinki 1977. The Kauśika-Sūtra quotes no text from AVS. 20, which contains ṛgvedic material compiled for the ritual use of one of the assistants of the *brahman* priest; see GONDA, V. L., p. 269.

[301] For other *paddhatis* on certain selected parts of the Sūtra (the Daśa karmāṇi brahmavedoktāni and the Atharvaṇīya-Paddhati on the house ritual; the Antyeṣṭi on the burial ceremony) see BLOOMFIELD, Edition, p. XIV.

[302] The question as to whether this work remained incomplete or has only been preserved up to section 48 has not yet been answered; see DIWEKAR etc., op. cit., p. X.

[303] See BLOOMFIELD, Ath. V. and GB. (see n. 238), p. 16f.; GONDA, V. L., p. 309f.

Chapter IV

THE PITṚMEDHASŪTRAS

The so-called *pitṛmedhasūtras* form an essential part of the ritual literature. They are here regarded as a category by themselves because the obsequial rites with which they are concerned are sometimes treated in separate manuals. In other cases however they are included in *śrautasūtras*, or also in *gṛhyasūtras*. Leaving the many interesting particulars and differences between the *sūtra* texts and the authorities of the secondary literature out of account a *pitṛmedha*[1] —mentioned already in Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa 13, 8—is a rite in honour of or for the benefit of a deceased person performed when the exact year of his death is forgotten or in any uneven year. His descendants collect his bones in a jar, place them on a bedstead and perform some ceremonies in the following night: among these a circumambulation; or Veda students or women beating their thighs, with hair loosened and wailing dance three times round the bones; the ceremony which is accompanied by lute-playing is performed three times. In the morning the bones are taken to a new place of rest and arranged so as to form a human body. Then that place is covered with a memorial mound made of stones and earth. However, the term *pitṛmedha* applies also to the cremation rites that have to take place immediately after death and a *pitṛmedhasūtra* or *pitṛmedha* text can be concerned with the obsequies (from the moment of death to the erection of the mound) in general.

The solution of the problem as to why the Baudhāyana, Bhāradvāja and Gautama schools had independent *pitṛmedhasūtras*, the Kātyāyana and Śāṅkhāyana schools and the Mānavas included the funeral rites in their *śrauta* manual and the followers of Āśvalāyana and Āgniveśya as well as the Kauśītakins and the Vaikhānasas consider them part of their *gṛhya* traditions seems to lie in the fact that the schools were not unanimous in according this honour to any Aryan. If it was required or usual that the deceased person was an *āhitāgni (agnicit)*[2] it is intelligible that the pertinent rites

[1] W. Caland, Die altindischen Todten- und Bestattungsgebräuche, Amsterdam Acad. 1896 (reprint Wiesbaden 1967), p. 129; and in GGA 1897, p. 287; Hillebrandt, Rit., p. 91; Keith, R. Ph. V. U., p. 421; Gonda, R. I. I, p. 134; Kashikar, S. Ś., p. 103; Singh, K. Ś. S., p. 122 (after Kātyāyana). Instead of *pitṛmedha* one finds also the terms *loṣṭaciti* "funeral pile of clods", or *śmaśānakaraṇam* "preparation of a burial ground and mound". See also N. C. C. I (1969), p. 245 sub Aparasūtra.

[2] Thus BPMS. 2, 3, 2; BhPMS. 1, 12, 13; HŚS. 28, 12, 13. BhPMS. 1, 12, 9; ĀpŚS. 31, 3, 45 allow (as far as possible) the same ritual in the case of an *anāhitāgni*.

were included in a *śrautasūtra*, the more so as they could involve the utilization and disposal of his sacred fires and of his sacrificial utensils which are placed on his body and burnt together with him:[3] "The sacrificer equipped with his sacrificial utensils goes straight to heaven".

The Baudhāyanīya-Pitṛmedhasūtra,[4] though a separate work, is handed down as an appendix of the Gṛhyasūtra, and sometimes even cited as a portion of this work. In the Baudhāyana corpus it follows the Gṛhyasūtra and its annexes. The two parts (three chapters in the edition) of this rather long treatise do not constitute a whole. Chapter I, written in the usual Baudhāyana style,—broad, digressive, alive to casuistry and alternative possibilities—and reproducing the *mantras* (found in the Taittirīya-Āraṇyaka) in full gives a regular and continuous account of the ritual—the funeral rites for the *āhitāgni* (a *saṃskāra*),[5] the cremation, the collection of the charred bones *(saṃcayana)*,[6] the repeated cremation of the bones *(punardāha)*,[7] the erection of the mound *(loṣṭacayana)* and the preliminary ritual acts and the rite for appeasing evil influences i.e. neutralizing the contagion by death *(śāntihoma, śāntikarman)*. The other chapters however are a disparate collection of additions to points discussed in chapter I, explanations or pertinent ritual acts, prescriptions to be observed on exceptional occasions—for instance, if a person dies in a foreign country or his mortal remains cannot be found—the rites to be performed if a person who has been missing returns alive after his death has been presumed; cremation of women—whether or not pregnant—and children, burial of young children; the *pitṛmedha* for those who have died a violent death; the line of conduct to be taken by a widow and the *brahmamedha*, a funeral rite for (learned) brahmins.[8] Chapter II is on one hand closely allied to chapter I—there are many cross references—and on the other related to the *pitṛmedhasūtras* of the subsequent Taittirīya schools—there are identical passages. Chapter III, which deals mainly with the cremation proper in various circumstances, is unlike II a whole in itself. Curiously enough, II and III have some ritual acts, e.g. cremation in effigy, in common; and so have III and I, although there are differences

---

[3] Cf. e.g. BPMS. 1, 9, 2; BhPMS. 1, 5, 16—1, 7, 2; ĀpŚS. 31, 2, 20—25. An *anāhitāgni* is cremated by means of his domestic fire (BhPMS 1, 12, 10; ĀpŚS. 31, 3, 46).

[4] Edited in the edition(s) of the Gṛhyasūtra, Mysore 1904, p. 357; 1920, p. 377; chapter II and III also by C. H. Raabe, Bijdrage tot de kennis van het Hindoesche doodenritueel, Thesis Utrecht 1911 (with many annotations). See also Caland, op. cit., p. IV and The Pitṛmedhasūtras of Baudhāyana, Hiraṇyakeśin, Gautama edited with . . . notes, Leipzig 1896 (²1966), p. I; VIII (on a *loṣṭacayanaprayoga* and some other later texts).

[5] See Kane, H. Dh. IV, p. 185; 189.

[6] See Caland, op. cit. (n. 1 above), p. 99; Kane, H. Dh. IV, p. 240.

[7] An optional rite, mentioned in the manuals of the Taittirīyas; see Caland, Todten- und Bestattungsgebräuche, p. 110.

[8] Compare the stanza quoted in BhPMS. 2, 1, 2; ĀpŚS. 31, 4, 2 and Caland's note on 31, 4, 1.

in circumstantiality;[9] the cremation rite *(dahanakalpa)* in 3, 1–4 differs considerably from that in chapter I. There is no doubt that II and III are at least in their present form of later date than I. This *sūtra* work and the *pitṛmedha* texts in general are rich in interesting ritual customs, part of which have parallels with other peoples.[10] For instance, the wife of the deceased should lie down by his side but one of his representatives—his brother etc.—should cause her to rise up again saying, "O wife, do thou rise up towards the world of those who are alive";[11] those who return home after attending a cremation should not look back.[12]

As to the other *pitṛmedhasūtras* of the Black Yajurveda the close relations between those of the Bhāradvāja, Āpastamba and Hiraṇyakeśin schools are conspicuous.[13] There is little difference in their arrangement and the texts are in many respects similar or even identical, be it that Āpastamba's is a little shorter than Bhāradvāja's.[14] Tradition has it that both Āpastamba and Hiraṇyakeśin have borrowed their *pitṛmedhasūtra* from the Bhāradvāja school,[15] which used an abbreviated and more conveniently arranged recast of Baudhāyana's work.[16] Arguing in favour of the theory that the Āpastambīyas must at first have followed the *pitṛmedhasūtra* of the Bhāradvājins and in course of time have proceeded to call it their own Kashikar[17] has concluded from the silence of Sāyaṇa, the commentator Cauṇḍapācārya (14th century) and others on ĀpŚS. XXXI *(pitṛmedha)* that at that time the obsequies did not yet form part of the Āpastamba corpus. The younger manuals do not entirely belie their origin since Hiraṇyakeśin's is not free from motivations and explanations.[18]

[9] For details see RAABE, op. cit., p. XIV.

[10] For a survey see RAABE, op. cit., p. 35.

[11] BPMS. 1, 8, 1f.; BhPMS. 1, 5, 6f.; ĀpŚS. 31, 2, 13f.; TĀ. 6, 1; 3; ṚV. 10, 18, 8.

[12] E.g. BPMS. 3, 4; BhPMS. 1, 8, 8.

[13] For a more detailed discussion see CALAND, Todten- und Bestattungsgebräuche, p. V; KASHIKAR, S. Bh., I, p. XLIV. The BhPMS., known only from a few manuscripts, has been edited by KASHIKAR, S. Bh. I, p. 227 (Bhāradvāja-Paitṛmedhika-sūtram); the ĀpPMS. by T. M. NARAYANA ŚASTRIGAL, Āpastamba-Pitṛmedha-sūtra, together with the commentary by Gārgya Gopālayajvan (and Kapardisvāmin's commentary in foot-notes, Grantha characters), Kumbhakonam 1916; the HPMS. by CALAND in Pitṛmedhasūtras (see above) and, together with the commentary of Mahādeva Dīkṣita at the end of K. B. ĀGĀŚE's edition of the Satyāṣāḍha-Śrautasūtra (chapters XXVIII and XXIX), Poona 1932. The BhPMS. has been translated by KASHIKAR, S. Bh. II, p. 460; the obsequies according to Āpastamba by CALAND, Ś. A. III, p. 420. CALAND's Todten- und Bestattungsgebräuche may be consulted as a commentary on these texts.

[14] However, part of the omitted portion occurs in ĀpDhS. 2, 15, 10.

[15] See also CALAND, Pitṛmedhasūtras, XIV; XVIII and Ś. A. III, p. 420. KASHIKAR, S. Bh. I, p. IL. As to HPMS. see CALAND in ZDMG 52, p. 434 referring to the commentator Mahādeva who makes mention of the borrowing from Bhāradvāja.

[16] Cf. CALAND, Pitṛmedhasūtras, p. X.

[17] KASHIKAR, in JORM 28 (1961), p. 3; S. Bh. I, p. XLV. See however CALAND, Pitṛmedhasūtras, p. XVII.

[18] Cf. BhārPMS. 1, 4, 2; 1, 6, 21; 1, 10, 3; 10f.; 2, 1, 12; also ĀpŚS. 31, 2, 2.

After the *brahmamedha* (2, 1) and rules for the *śmaśānaciti* (2–5) Bhāradvāja's text contains prescriptions for the Yamayajña (2, 6f.), which is a different rite, namely a monthly *bali* offered to Yama,[19] and five chapters on incidental rites and supplementary rules. Āpastamba's[20] work, which consists of two chapters *(praśna)*, seems to have been a separate Pitṛmedhasūtra from the beginning. Chapter I deals with the rites to be performed on the eve and the day of death, the cremation proper and the preparations for it as well as the return home of the mourners; chapter II with the *loṣṭaciti* ceremonies. Hiraṇyakeśin's *pitṛmedha* text has been amplified by another supplement, viz. the funeral rites to be observed in the case of a pregnant woman coming to die.[21]

Chapter V of the Vaikhānasa-Smārtasūtra is devoted to the funeral rites—for the *āhitāgni* as well as the common householder and their wives—be it that the last sections (13–15) deal with the *śrāddha* rites. The subjects treated are: the rites in the house of the deceased person, the conveyance of the dead body to the cremation ground; the dead body on the pyre; the cremation; the return of those who have attended the cremation; the rites to be observed during the first ten days; abnormal death; death of little children. By way of introduction section I deals with the moribund person and the two paths the prospect of which is in this late text held out to the dying—viz. that by which one reaches without returning the "place of *brahman*" and that by which one returns—as well as with the process of dying. Section 8 treats of the disposal of the dead body of ascetics who have no ritual fires; they are interred in sitting posture. In section 11 the author deals with persons whose cremation is not allowed: those who die a violent death, suicides, drunkards, those who have met with an accident, etc. There are some peculiarities of minor importance.

After mentioning (in 8, 6 and 7) the measures to be taken by the one who is on the verge of death—he should set up and worship his fires—, the Mānava-Śrautasūtra deals in the comparatively succinct section 8, 19 with "the prescriptions for one who has set up his fires and dies", in the shorter section 8, 20 with the *anāhitāgni* who has passed away, in 8, 21 with those who have died in a foreign country or have been killed in battle. In section 23 the author treats the observances of the widow who according to Śākalya now is without sacred fire and sacrifices, her attending one fire and the cremation of a deceased wife. The differences in particulars with the Taittirīya texts are considerable. The chapters occur among the supplements and do not create the impression of being old.

In the Āgniveśya-Gṛhyasūtra the obsequies are rather elaborately treated in the sections 3, 4–8 of which 5, 6 and 8 correspond with BPMS. 1, 1–20; 7 with

---

[19] It occurs also at BGŚS. 1, 21.

[20] See also CALAND, in ZDMG 52, p. 431; B. V. KAMESVARA AIYER, in QJMS 13, p. 525.

[21] See KASHIKAR, in JORM 28, p. 8 and S. Bh. I, p. XLIX, where also observations on the secondary character of the HPMS. chapters, which were adopted from the Bhāradvājins.

BPMS. 1, 21–2, 4 and 4 is reminescent of and in part identical with many passages in BPMS. 3, 1–5.

The funeral rites of the Vājasaneyins are handed down in KŚS. 21, 3–4 (the *pitṛmedha*, i.e. the *loṣṭaciti* and the preliminary acts) and 25, 7–8 (death and cremation).

The Gautama-Pitṛmedhasūtra[22] belonging to the Rāṇāyanīya recension of the Sāmaveda—and associated with the Drāhyāyaṇa-Śrautasūtra and the Khādira-Gṛhyasūtra—is available in Anantayajvan's commentary[23] on the Gautamasūtra. It contains sections on the obsequies proper, the collection of the bones, the *śānti* rites and recremation and, at the end, the rules of the cremation of a person who does not maintain *śrauta* fires. These are (in 2, 2–6) preceded by the Gautama-Śrāddhakalpa[24]—quoted also as Chandoga- or Khādira-Śrāddhakalpa—and correspond to the Gobhila-Śrāddhakalpa[25] of the Kauthumas, although there are in places considerable differences. The text of the Gautamas has been amplified by later passages which not infrequently interrupt the context. The sūtras 2, 7, 7–32 of the Gautama-Pitṛmedhasūtra are literally identical with DŚS. 23, 4, 16–23. This text which is "one of the last offshoots of the *sūtra* period" (Caland) has undergone the influence of Southern texts, especially from Baudhāyana and is also closely related to the Vaikhānasasūtra.[26]

Whereas Śāṅkhāyana deals with the funeral rites of an *āhitāgni*—death, cremation, collection of the bones, neutralization of the evil influences (here called "the fence")—within the comparatively small compass of the sections 14–16 of his Śrautasūtra, Āśvalāyana prescribes them in his Gṛhyasūtra, chapter IV, sections 1–6:[27] interestingly enough, the rules given are explicitly said to apply to an *āhitāgni*: 4, 1ff.

> "If disease befalls one who has set up his *(śrauta)* fires, he should leave his home (and go) to the eastern, or northern, or north-eastern direction. 'The sacred fires are fond of the village', thus it is said. 'Longing for it (and) desirous of returning to the village they might restore him to health' thus it is understood (in the *śruti*)".

The Kauṣītaka-Gṛhya(sūtra) includes this subject in chapter V.

Chapter *(adhyāya)* XI of the Kauśika-Sūtra deals with the disposal of the dead (*pitṛmedha*, 80–86) and the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* (87–89). This text is characterized by a number of interesting particulars. After the cremation the bones are deposited at the root of a tree to the accompaniment of a stanza in which

---

[22] See CALAND, Pitṛmedhasūtras; PARPOLA, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 55; N. C. C. VI (1971), p. 229.

[23] See also CALAND, Pitṛmedhasūtras, p. XXII.

[24] W. CALAND, Der Gautamaśrāddhakalpa, in Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde, 6, 1 (45), The Hague 1895, p. 97.

[25] Edited (with a commentary) by M. CH. K. TARKĀLAṄKĀRA in Gobhila-Pariśiṣṭa I, ²Calcutta 1909 (Bibl. Ind.).

[26] CALAND, in Bijdragen, p. 99f., and in P. M. S., p. XXIII.

[27] Cf. R. ROTH, in ZDMG 8, p. 467; F. M. MÜLLER, in ZDMG 9, p. 1.

the tree is requested not to press heavily on them.[28] When the lutes are played[29] a noise is—no doubt to scare away the evil spirits—made by the beating of an old shoe on an empty pot. At the end of the ceremonies the *sūtrakāra* has a boat, furnished with gold and grain, and seven small canals made; those present must go aboard, pronouncing the *mantra* "Mount this boat of Savitar; may we cross over misery . . .".[30]

The funeral rites of the Kāṭhaka school have been preserved in their *paddhati* Gṛhyapañcikā which describes them in two places in prose mixed with citations in *ślokas*.[31] Those of the Kauthumas are found in the late Karmapradīpa (3, 1–4).[32]

[28] KauśS. 82, 32; AVŚ. 18, 2, 25.
[29] See above; KauśS. 84, 9.
[30] KauśS. 86, 25f.; AVŚ. 12, 2, 48.
[31] Cf. CALAND, Todten- und Bestattungsgebräuche, p. IX.
[32] SUBRAHMAṆYAVIDVĀN, Antyeṣṭidīpikā, Benares 1886 deals with this ritual on the basis of the Karmapradīpa, Lāṭyāyana and the tradition of the school.

Chapter V

THE RITUAL SŪTRAS AS HISTORICAL SOURCES

In the preceding chapters attention has been focussed on the very essence and the main aspects of the ritual *sūtras* as manuals of instruction for the guidance of religious teachers and officiants and as unique sources of our knowledge of ritualism in general and the ancient Indian rites in particular. What should concern us at present is their significance from the point of view of the history of Indian culture.[1] The importance of the *sūtras* for students of cultural anthropology, comparative religion and the history of civilization in general may once again be emphasized.[2] In perusing the relevant texts it will soon be clear that in this respect the domestic *sūtras* are a source of more copious information than the *śrauta* texts which—though not devoid of sidelights on social and cultural circumstances—concentrate completely on ritual and ceremonial details. Notwithstanding their 'aphoristic' style both classes of *sūtra* contain numerous references to social life,[3] the position of women, dress and ornaments, furniture, weapons and instruments,[4] food and drink,[5] games and amusements, arts and crafts,[6] the building of houses,[7] animals,[8] agriculture, music,[9] education,

[1] Most of the texts mentioned in this chapter have been chosen at random; emphasis has been laid on those subjects which could not be touched upon in the preceding part of this volume and on features and topics which are dealt with in the secondary literature on this literary genre. For general information see: E. Washburn Hopkins, Family life and social customs . . . in the sūtras, in C. H. I. I, p. 227; P. L. Bhargava, India in the Vedic age, Lucknow 1956; Gopal, I. V. K. (mainly based on gṛhya- and dharmasūtras); V. M. Apte, Social and religious life in the gṛhyasūtras, Bombay (1939) ²1954; Batakrishna Ghosh, The Hindu ideal of life according to the gṛhyasūtras, in I. C. 8 (1941—42), p. 219; Singh, K. Ś. S., p. 147; Kashikar, S. Ś., p. 165; N. N. Bhattacharyya, Ancient Indian rituals and their social contents, London 1975; R. K. Choudhary, Some aspects of social history as gleaned from Jaiminīya-Gṛhyasūtra, JOIB 3, p. 391; H. Zimmer, Altindisches Leben, Berlin 1879 (idealizing) is still utilizable if read with caution.

[2] See Winternitz, G. I. L., I, p. 234; J. Gonda, Over de Voor-Indische Gṛhyasūtra-literatuur, Handelingen 13th Vlaams Philologencongres, Gent 1936, p. 126. For a striking parallel between India and Babylonia see W. F. Albright and P. E. Dumont, JAOS 54, p. 107. For the *pitṛmedhasūtras* see chapter IV above.

[3] See also A. Chattopadhyay, Some social aspects in the Āpastamba-Gṛhyasūtra, IA 3, 2 (1967), p. 37; R. K. Choudhary in JOSB 3, p. 391 (based on JGS).

[4] E.g. BŚS. 15, 15; 20, 27; BhŚS. 9, 16, 15ff.; ĀpŚS. 20, 22, 1.

[5] See e.g. BŚS. 24, 5; 28, 13; cf. Kashikar, S. Ś., p. 169.

[6] For BŚS. 15, 13—15; VādhŚS. 76 (AO. 4, p. 181) see Caland, in AO. 4, p. 182.

[7] PGS. 3, 4, 1f. *(śālākarman)*.

[8] E.g. BŚS. 2, 5; 24, 5; 31. On the camel (PGS. 3, 15, 5): K. Hoffmann, in Wör-

astronomy and chronology,[10] measurements and, of course, various aspects of magic and religion.[11]

Recognizing the three Aryan estates (*varṇa*, not "caste")—brahmins, *kṣatriyas* and *vaiśyas*—the *sūtras*—first and foremost intent on the good and the interests of the brahmins—regard the lower orders, *śūdras*,[12] slaves etc. as part of the social structure. The *gṛhyasūtras*, whilst enlarging upon the ritual duties of the two 'privileged classes' and the commons, shed also some light on their respective occupations and obligations. There are some interesting sidelights on what obviously was considered decent, proper, or even ideal; for instance on the qualities which a brahmin invited to a dinner was expected to possess; ŚGS. 1, 2, 2ff.:

> "A (fine) voice, a (dignified) appearance, (a suitable) age, learning, moral character, (right) conduct are the qualities (required). Learning, however, outweighs every (other qualification). One should not pass over a learned (brahmin)".

The *gṛhyasūtras* practically recognize life only as country or village life. Of social and political conditions they contain almost nothing except for a few references to circumstances affecting family life.[13] With the exception of the 'private houses' of the heads of families the only edifice mentioned is the "hall" *(sabhā)*,[14] sometimes with a 'guest-chamber' *(avasatha)*[15] as an annex. Outside the village *(grāma)* is the wilderness, the land neither cultivated nor

---

ter und Sachen 21, p. 144; on the *godhā* "a kind of lizard" (VaikhŚS. 18, 19): H. Lüders, in ZDMG 96, p. 23 (= Kleine Schriften, Wiesbaden 1973), p. 490.

[9] Including dance, song and instrumental music (arched harp: *vīṇā*; drum: *dundubhi* etc.). Cf. e.g. ĀpŚS. 18, 4, 4; 7; 18, 5, 2; 20, 6, 5; 10: 14; 20, 7, 5; 21, 17, 8; 16f.; 21, 18, 8; 21, 19, 3; 31, 5, 26; KŚS. 13, 2, 20f.; 13, 3, 15; 20, 2, 7; 20, 3, 2; 21, 3, 11; ŚGS. 1, 22, 11 and see J. Basu, in Prabuddha Bharata 66, Mayavati 1961, p. 223; V. Raghavan, in Journal of the Music Academy 33, Madras 1962, p. 127.

[10] See Caland, Über . . . Baudhāyana, p. 36.

[11] The collections of the relevant passages—especially from the *śrauta* works—are incomplete. From the statements made in these ritual texts authors have too often drawn incautious conclusions with regard to the daily life of the Indian people. Especially the materials furnished by the *śrautasūtras* cannot be regarded as representative of the Indian culture of the later Vedic period as a whole. If for instance references to dancing are infrequent one should hesitate to infer that dance was less popular than music. Our information on the material and spiritual life of the common man is scanty.

[12] See e.g. BŚS. 16, 20; 18, 8; ĀpŚS. 1, 19, 9 (with Caland's note); 1, 21, 9; 10, 12, 10; 13, 16, 8; 20, 5, 13; 22, 26, 5; ŚŚS. 16, 4, 6; KŚS. 21, 4, 12ff.; PGS. 1, 4, 8ff.; GGS. 3, 2, 56.

[13] E.g. HGS. 1, 14, 2; KāGS. 65, 8; GGS. 3, 3, 25; ĀśvGS. 3, 12, 1. Unlike W. Rau, Staat und Gesellschaft im alten Indien, Wiesbaden 1957, p. 52 K. Mylius, in Ethnologisch-Archäologische Zeitschrift 10 (Berlin 1969), p. 33 is of the opinion that there were towns in the late Vedic period. See also Mylius, in MIO 17 (Berlin 1972), p. 369.

[14] BŚS. 2, 18; 5, 8; 3, 14; 14, 18; ĀpŚS. 5, 4, 7; 5, 18, 2; 5, 19, 2; HŚS. 3, 3, 14; VaitS. 6, 5; PGS. 3, 13, 2f.; KauśS. 38, 27ff. etc.

[15] ĀpŚS. 5, 4, 7; HŚS. 3, 3, 14.

grazed *(araṇya)* often referred to as a place of retirement, isolation or banishment.[16]

Being codifications of rules, rites and customs long practised the *gṛhyasūtras* incorporate also welcome information on traditional behaviour and established practices.[17] The custom of sipping water before and after a meal with the formulas of ĀśvGS. 1, 24, 13 and 28[18]—which stand, as it were, for the prologue and epilogue of the ritual drama of a dinner—is in force even to the present day. There are also ritual procedures to cause discordance between the king and his subjects (ĀśvŚS. 2, 11, 13).

We are informed of numerous pieces of popular belief incorporated in some ritual or other. For instance, of what might be called the secondary use of certain sacrificial substances. If a man has no appetite without knowing the cause of this indisposition, or if he is seriously ill he should eat two of the rice balls offered to the deceased ancestors (ĀśvŚS. 2, 7, 16). One should not partake of the fruits of the new harvest before performing the *agnihotra* ritual (ĀśvŚS. 2, 9, 2). One should avoid pronouncing verses or formulas containing words for "scorched, perished, killed, burnt" (ĀśvŚS. 2, 14, 23). The birth of a pair of twins requires a special sacrifice because it forebodes evil, childlessness if the twins are human, want of cattle if they are calves (ĀpŚS. 9, 14, 7ff.).[19] Certain ritual acts are to be performed with the thumbs, the relevant passages throwing light on the religious significance of thumbs and toes.[20] There is ample evidence that the right hand or the right side of the body was decidedly preferred to the left. In enumerations etc. one begins with the right; complicated ritual actions are performed in such a way that they begin on the right and end on the left side. The left side being widely associated with women, the wife lies on the left side of her husband. The man who wishes to put to sleep a woman must pronounce a definite incantation while gazing at the right-hand leg of her bed. The *adhvaryu* has to press with his right foot the foot-prints of the right foreleg of the cow with which the *soma* has been bought. Even a minute—and quite natural—detail such as "the upper kindling wood must be taken up by the right hand, the lower kindling wood by the left" is explicitly mentioned.[21]

---

[16] ĀpŚS. 14, 13, 7; 20, 24, 16; HŚS. 10, 7, 2; 17, 3, 24; LŚS. 5, 8, 2; 9, 8, 15; DŚS. 14, 4, 2; ŚGS. 3, 5, 2; PGS. 3, 8, 3; KauṣGS. 3, 4, 2 etc.

[17] See also S. R. SEHGAL, Śāṅkhāyana gṛhya sūtram, Delhi 1960, p. 53 (the term 'folklore' used in the subtitle of this book and in the title of this chapter can create misunderstanding).

[18] V. M. APTE, in NIA 3, p. 175.

[19] For twins see GONDA, The dual deities in the religion of the Veda, Amsterdam Acad. 1974, p. 33.

[20] ĀpŚS. 18, 8, 17; 31, 1, 17; see CALAND, in Museum 10 (1903), p. 35. Cf. also HGS. 1, 20, 1 etc. If a young man desires to generate sons he should as part of the marriage rites seize the thumb of his bride. See e.g. also ĀpŚS. 10, 11, 3.

[21] See e.g. MŚS. 1, 7, 3, 31; 6, 1, 8, 5; ĀpŚS. 8, 6, 12 (with Caland's note); KauśS. 36, 4; ĀpŚS. 10, 22, 11; BhārPar. 213; ĀśvGS. 2, 6, 7; H. OERTEL, Contributions to the history of the Brāhmaṇa literature, JAOS 26, p. 188; and in general, W. CALAND, Een Indogermaansch lustratie-gebruik, Amsterdam Acad. 1898; J. GONDA,

Sacred grass, the hide of an antelope, *mantras* and brahmins do not lose their holy power if they are employed more than once, but *mantras* are desecrated in the mouth of a *śūdra* (GGSPar. 2, 85f.). Various provisions are made against the risks taken by the man who maintains his sacred fire when he travels abroad.[22] Many sacrificial implements are to be threefold, many ritual acts are performed three times—DŚS. 1, 2, 2 prescribes a threefold announcement of definite seats etc.; ĀpŚS. 20, 18, 6, while dealing with the horse sacrifice, has the principal queen three times express disapproval and the other wives of the king three times utter abusive expressions.[23]

The reader acquaints himself with various so-called domestic superstitions, for instance with a large number of auspicious objects or events—a twig that has grown towards the north, east, or north-east and has many leaves and shoots (BhŚS. 1, 2, 9); the middle *palāśa* leaf[24] etc.—with various amulets, their uses and efficacy as well as the possibility of transmitting 'sin' or 'evil';[25] with the danger of blaming or reviling (ĀpŚS. 21, 9, 2ff.); with the power proceeding from the eye[26]—neither a woman nor a *śūdra* should gaze at definite oblations (BhŚS. 11, 2, 17); "with the formula 'I gaze on thee with the eye of Mitra' one should gaze at the grain container" (BhŚS. 1, 19, 9; ĀśvGS. 1, 24, 14 etc.); the bride should look at the bridegroom with a benign eye (BGS. 1, 1, 25)—; with the influence ascribed to fixation of thoughts: "the *adhvaryu* should think of him whom he hates" (BhŚS. 2, 3, 14); with the importance attached to the points of the compass or quarters of the universe;[27] with various rites and practices pertaining to the conjugal relations or to family affairs;[28] with a variety of omina, portents or occurrences which may spell evil, for instance what one has to say and to do if a bird befouls one's body or if a fruit falls down unexpectedly.[29] Names were also in Vedic India believed to be naturally and indissolubly connected with their bearer. One should not pronounce the name of the sacrificer who is being consecrated;[30] being prepared for the sacrifice he is in an abnormal position and is not permitted to take an ordinary part in

---

The significance of the right hand and the right side in Vedic ritual, Religion 2 (1972), p. 1.

[22] E.g. BŚS. 24, 31; BhŚS. 4, 19, 9; 5, 2, 11 (where a distinction is made between persons who are ordinarily at home and those who are normally travelling); 6, 5, 3; ĀpŚS. 5, 3, 22; 6, 24, 1; 6, 28, 1; 11, 17, 1.

[23] See also KauśS. 8, 6; 26, 32; 61, 15ff.; GGS. 1, 8, 27; 2, 9, 16; KŚS. 5, 1, 25 etc., and J. GONDA, Triads in the Veda, Amsterdam Acad. 1976.

[24] See CALAND, in ZDMG 53, p. 212; in connexion with ĀśvGS. 1, 22, 21 APTE, in NIA 3, p. 171.

[25] E.g. GGS. 3, 8, 6; HGS. 1, 16, 2; 16.

[26] See J. GONDA, Eye and gaze in the Veda, Amsterdam Acad. 1969.

[27] BhŚS. 13, 1, 7f.; GGS. 3, 7, 4f. etc.

[28] See e.g. ĀpGS. 3, 9, 1ff.; HGS. 1, 14, 1ff.; 1, 24, 1ff.

[29] See A. N. PANDE, in Journal Bihar Research Society 34 (Patna 1948), p. 71; cf. e.g. HGS. 1, 5, 16f.; 1, 17, 5.

[30] ĀpŚS. 10, 13, 2; see J. GONDA, Notes on names and the name of God in ancient India, Amsterdam Acad. 1970, p. 35 (also on other references to names).

social life. Girls named after asterisms, trees and rivers are contemptible; one should not marry them (ĀpGS. 1, 3, 12). The one who knows the name of a being is able to exercise power over it (ĀpŚS. 16, 18, 6). The man who assumes a new dignity or performs one of the great solemn sacrifices may assume a new title, e.g. *somayājin* "one who has performed a *soma* sacrifice".[31]

Though admitting some new and uncommon deities to their pantheon[32] the *sūtras* fully recognize the important gods—"the three times eleven" (HGS. 2, 17, 4)—of the earlier period.[33] Whereas their role in the solemn rites is largely traditional, the *gṛhyasūtras* give an impression of their specialized functions and concerns in the various domestic and popular rites. Among them Agni, "the first of the gods" and bearer of the oblations, a great source of energy and insight, a protector of men,[34] invoked at all fire rites, is the foremost; HGS. 1, 2, 18:

> "Thou whom we have set to work, O Jātavedas, carry forward (our offerings). O Agni, perceive this rite as it is performed (by us). Thou art a healer, a creator of medicine. Through thee may we obtain cows, horses and men. *Svāhā!*"

Under various circumstances, Indra, though not equal to Agni in importance but largely responsible for man's welfare, is—mainly in the solemn rites, it is true—invoked or one of his deeds commemorated.[35] Among the major gods are, also in the *gṛhyasūtras*, Soma[36] and Varuṇa.[37] Whilst invoking these gods and other members of the ancient pantheon the authors cling as a rule to the traditions of their religion regarding divine might and influence as supplementing human power and ability. In the *gṛhyasūtras*—and no doubt in the religion of the masses—Rudra, invoked under many names and an important deity, is chiefly propitiated for the sake of the well-being of cattle and besought to save the sacrificer and his herd from his destructive wrath.[38] The 'spit-ox' sacrifice

---

[31] KŚS. 4, 2, 45; HGS. 2, 4, 15. For other points of ritual interest see also W. Caland, in ZDMG 51, p. 128; 52, p. 425; 53, p. 205; 696; 54, p. 97; 55, p. 261; 56, p. 554; 57, p. 740; 58, p. 506.

[32] E.g. Mahārāja, invoked (GGS. 4, 7, 41) by those who build a house, and belonging to a group of deities (including also Kubera, Takṣaka, Vaiśāleya) to whom a boy is entrusted (BhGS. 1, 8: 8, 1, *upanayana*); Śāka and Jañjabha, worshipped at BhGS. 2, 20: 52, 12; HGS. 1, 10, 4 *(samāvartana)*.

[33] See A. N. Pande, The role of the Vedic gods in the gṛhyasūtras, JGJRI 16, p. 91; Gopal, I. V. K., p. 465; Rolland, R. D. V., p. 37.

[34] See e.g. PGS. 1, 5, 11; HGS. 1, 2, 11; 18; 1, 3, 5; 10; 1, 7, 2; 14; 1, 8, 4; ŚGS. 1, 7, 9; 1, 25, 7; 2, 10, 4; 2, 13, 5; ĀśvŚS. 1, 10, 23; 1, 21, 1; 4; 2, 1, 6; 2, 4, 14; VārGS. 1, 22f.

[35] E.g. HGS. 1, 4, 8; 11; MGS. 1, 8, 11; 1, 14, 16; MŚS. 1, 4, 2, 6; ŚGS. 2, 15, 7 (relations with the king); 3, 1, 16; KāGS. 25, 9; VāGS. 14, 1; PGS. 1, 9, 5; ĀśvŚS. 1, 6, 1; 2, 10, 16; 2, 11, 8; ŚŚS. 1, 8, 13.

[36] E.g. HGS. 1, 15, 1; 1, 20, 2; ĀśvGS. 1, 17, 10; ĀgnGS. 2, 2, 5; KāGS. 40, 11; VaikhGS. 1, 14.

[37] E.g. HGS. 1, 8, 16; 1, 17, 6; GGS. 4, 7, 41; MGS. 1, 11, 13; 2, 10, 8; KāGS. 19, 7; 57, 3.

[38] Cf. e.g. also HGS. 1, 16, 8ff.; PGS. 3, 15, 7ff.

(śūlagava) is offered to him in order to ensure prosperity and at the end of every domestic sacrifice he receives a special oblation, the *yajñavāstu*.[39] A memorial stanza in ŚGS. 1, 10, 9 reads as follows:

> "When one has repeated a text sacred to Rudra, to the demons, to the Fathers, to the *asuras*, or one that contains an imprecation one shall touch water (for purification)".

Viṣṇu,[40] while growing in importance and receiving oblations in many solemn and domestic rites, is not yet identified with Nārāyaṇa who is mentioned in connexion with the Puruṣa hymn (ṚV. 10, 90) and, in the later *gṛhyasūtras*, with the Nārāyaṇa-*bali*.[41]

Worship is accorded to a considerable number of goddesses.[42] Sītā, literally "Furrow", is an agricultural deity entitled to a special sacrifice.[43] In GGS. 4, 4, 29f. she is accompanied by Āśā "Hope", Araḍā and Anaghā, obviously likewise protectresses of agriculture. The goddess of the sixth day (of the bright lunar fortnight) Ṣaṣṭhī is worshipped by a man "who has a hundred thousand (wishes) or only one wish".[44] Other female deities are e.g. the Earth, Vaśinī, Anumati, Śrī, Rudra's sister Ambikā,[45] such figures as Hrī "Modesty", Puṣṭi "Prosperity" as well as the consorts of the great male gods Indrāṇi, Varunāṇi, Rudrāṇi.[46]

We find in these texts for the first time references to images of gods: Īśāna "the Lord" and Kṣetrapati "the Lord of the soil or site" are at ĀpGS. 7, 20, 1; 13 led to a definite place.

Goblins of disease and disaster have naturally a prominent place in domestic and popular ritual. In the *gṛhyasūtras* a considerable variety of demons,[47] spiritually and materially harmful and partly belonging to an otherwise unknown pantheon, is invoked and even adored in order to remove every manifestation of evil—including disease—, to ward off disaster, in short to get rid of them.[48] PGS. 1, 16, 24 is an interesting instance:

> "If (the demon causing disease) Kumāra ("Boy") attacks the boy, the father covers him ... with an upper garment, takes him on his lap and murmurs:

---

[39] GGS. 1, 8, 26ff.; KhGS. 2, 1, 26f. For Rudra see also CALAND, in ZDMG 53, p. 213.

[40] For Viṣṇu's role in marriage rites see e.g. HGS. 1, 21, 1; 1, 25, 1.

[41] ĀpŚS. 16, 28, 3; ŚŚS. 16, 13, 1; see also KŚS. 24, 7, 35; LŚS. 10, 13, 4; ĀgnGS. 3, 11, 4; VaikhSmS. 7, 4; 10, 9f.

[42] For an enumeration see GOPAL, I. V. K., p. 466.

[43] PGS. 2, 17; for Sītā see J. GONDA, Aspects of early Viṣṇuism, Utrecht 1954, ²Delhi 1969, p. 219.

[44] MGS. 2, 13; the name of this goddess occurs also in KāGS. 19, 7; BGS. 3, 7, 17; BGŚS. 4, 2, 22.

[45] BGS. 2, 8, 9; 3, 7, 16; PGS. 2, 10, 3; HGS. 1, 6, 5; ŚGS. 2, 14, 4; 14; ĀgnGS. 2, 5, 3; ĀpŚS. 8, 18, 1.

[46] PGS. 3, 8, 10; KāGS. 20, 2 (also Gandharvāṇī and Udakāni).

[47] PANDE, in Journal Bihar Research Society, 34, p. 59.

[48] See e.g. BGS. 2, 1, 19 (female demons representing childhood diseases); ŚGS. 1, 10, 9; 1, 23, 1; HGS. 2, 7, 1ff.; ĀpŚS. 7, 18, 1; GGS. 4, 9, 19; PGS. 1, 16, 23f.

'Kūrkura, Sukūrkura, Kūrkura, who holds fast children. *Cet! cet!* doggy! Let (him) go. Reverence be to thee, the Sīsara, barker, bender! True the gods have given thee a boon. Hast thou then chosen my boy? . . .'"

Wicked or angry persons, possessed by evil spirits are regarded and treated in a similar way.[49] Part of the pertinent passages have a certain relevance to the history of medicine.[50]

[49] Cf. HGS. 1, 15, 3; PGS. 3, 13, 5.

[50] On VārGSPar. 27 see P. ROLLAND, in Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft 30, p. 129.

Chapter VI

STYLE AND COMPOSITION

The *śrautasūtras* deal with the intricate and elaborate ritual sacrifices in a concise language which, while vigorous in brevity and exactness,[1] leaves much to be tacitly understood.[2] This was possible because these technical compendia were composed for future specialists, not for the ignorant.[3] The complex details, the common and special features of the sacrificial rites—probably originating in re-arranged notes made for the use of officiants—are sagaciously isolated and cleverly clothed in the form of rules and prescriptions. Their method is to a lesser extent followed by the authors of the *gṛhyasūtras* which are often broader—especially Hiraṇyakeśin is inclined to circumstantiality—, less severe in style and less technical in ritual particulars. In general lines the development of the genre is clear.[4] Whereas Baudhāyana—and to a considerably less extent Āpastamba and Hiraṇyakeśin—represent the earlier stage in which the *brāhmaṇa* style has left many traces in the form of narrative episodes, longer quotations etc., a purer variety of the typical *sūtra* mode of composition and verbal expression is characteristic of the Kātyāyana- and Kauśika-Sūtras. Between this genre and the grammatical *sūtras* there is much similarity, possibly also community of origin; the main difference is that the grammarians describe, the ritualists prescribe and often justify their rules.

[1] According to an Indian definition (Singh, K. Ś. S., p. 137) "*sūtras* should be concise, indicative of their purport, composed of few letters and words and in every way meaningful".

[2] Yet the opinion that the *sūtras* "have in fact no style save that attained by scrupulous brevity" (E. W. Hopkins, in C. H. I. I, p. 237) needs revision. See also P. v. Bradke, in ZDMG 36, p. 472; R. Sh. Bhattacharya, Some characteristics of the sūtras, Calcutta Review 138, p. 328; T. N. Dave, Technique of sūtra-writing, in Śaradāpīṭhapatrikā 1ff. (in instalments), Dwarka 1962ff.; Singh, K. Ś. S., p. 137.

[3] Students and functionaries could resort to the depositories of the oral tradition for further information. A modern scholar is, in spite of the help rendered by commentaries and *prayogas*, often confronted with puzzling questions. It is for instance very difficult to master the technique of the *hautra mantras*—mentioned in ĀśvŚS. V—VIII—because the recording of the exact directions given to the *hotar* and his assistants involves the observation of complicated rules (cf. W. Caland, Vaitānasūtra, p. X; Kashikar, S. Ś., p. 83): in some sacrifices they have to execute combined recitations of two hymns by joining sometimes two quarters of stanzas, sometimes half stanzas and sometimes complete stanzas. Caland, Zauberritual, p. IV characterized the Kauśika-Sūtra as an aide-mémoire.

[4] See also L. Renou, Histoire de la langue sanskrite, Lyon-Paris 1956, p. 53.

As already intimated, the contents of most *śrautasūtras* are arranged systematically,[5] the archetypes *(prakṛti)* of the sacrificial ceremonies being described first. They are followed by topics which, though requiring separate treatment because of their nature and extent, can in this place be treated in a considerably condensed form. Thereafter come the individual sacrifices (*vikṛti*, ectypes) of which only comparatively few special features remain to be mentioned. Aiming at the elimination of any descriptive and narrative element the authors reorganize the material in accordance with the inherent systematism of the rituals. The same principle of proceeding from a general schema to particulars and exceptions is often applied in the several sections and subsections. While methodically distinguishing between common and special elements the authors take care that the order of their rules normally corresponds to the natural sequence of the ritual.[6] The economy of words resulting from this procedure is as evident as the didactic advantages. Even the compiler of such an unconventional manual as the Kauśikasūtra begins by describing the sacrifices of full and new moon because the magical rites which are the subject of the following chapters are to be performed during one of these two sacrifices. The composition of many episodes or more or less separate sections likewise attests to the compilers' skill in arranging their material. That the domestic manuals were, generally speaking, compiled in accordance with well-devised methods of composition is beyond doubt. With the exception of some additions the contents are often well arranged. In describing the *saṃskāras* the chronological order is maintained; the regular and more important rites precede the special and occasional ones; the *mantras* and ritual acts are often skilfully and harmoniously combined.[7]

What can be understood from the context is as a rule left unexpressed. Thus the functionary who has to perform definite acts is usually not indicated if it is known upon whom the action is normally enjoined.[8] Not only the subject is often omitted—e.g. BhŚS. 1, 2, 7 "(the sacrificer) undertakes the vow, (the *adhvaryu*) sets out (to fetch) a twig"—the object or another element of the sentence can be spared as well.[9] The same purpose is served by the omission of names of deities, as is explicitly indicated at ĀśvŚS. 2, 1, 22:

[5] Cf. also RENOU, in JA 251, p. 175; PARPOLA, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 26.

[6] Hence even cases of recapitulative sentence connexion (GONDA, Stylistic repetition (see no. 60), p. 316), e.g. ĀśvŚS. 2, 2, 2: 4; VaikhŚS. 4, 13.

[7] For exceptions see e.g. H. OLDENBERG, Das Śāṅkhāyana-Gṛhyam, in WEBER, I. S. XV, p. 1ff.; H. J. W. SALOMONS, Het Hindoesche huisritueel volgens de school van Bhāradvāja, Thesis Utrecht 1913, p. XIV; L. A. RAVI VARMA, Āgniveśya-gṛhya-sūtra, Trivandrum 1940, p. X.

[8] E.g. ĀśvŚS. 2, 1, 16 (fetching is the task of the *adhvaryu*); 20 (reciting the *hotar*'s); 3, 1, 8; 18; BhŚS. 14, 12, 1. For an exception see ĀśvŚS. 3, 2, 4 "directed by the *adhvaryu* the *maitrāvaruṇa* directs the *hotar* with directions": "so the *hotar* does not expect a direction from the *adhvaryu*" (comm.).

[9] E.g. BhŚS. 1, 24, 1 "the (sacrificer's) wife crushes (the grains)"; cf. also 14, 12, 9; an instrumentalis agentis 14, 12, 10; the instrumental *ṛcā* in "with the following *(ṛc)*" often in cases such as ĀpŚS. 1, 1, 4 (5); cf. also *sūtras* such as DŚS. 1, 2, 2;

"Everywhere (viz. in the *vikṛti* rites, the ectypes) on the arrival (invocation) of a deity (there is) absence (of the names) of the regular (gods, mentioned in the archetype)".

When the name of an authority is followed by an object the *sūtra* records one of his injunctions: LŚS. 1, 1, 26 "Śāṇḍilya (prescribes) disregard".

When a term is to be supplied from a preceding sentence some commentators[10] speak of *anuvṛtti* "the continued influence of a preceding rule in several consecutive sentences". However, this technique of the grammarians[11] is, also on account of the difference in subject-matter, much less strictly and consistently applied in the ritual *sūtras*.

Striving after the ideal of shortness the authors like to avoid the repetition of a long description by "in the same way" *(evam)*.[12] In formulating complex statements the repetition of common elements is possibly omitted.[13] Thus when two teachers agree, Lāṭyāyana (e.g. 3, 1, 24) gives their common opinion followed by their names united in a copulative compound. In this respect also Baudhāyana's work is conspicuous by its exceptions: for instance, in dealing with the three first-fruit sacrifices[14] he describes the first and second with much repetition of words, the third in a condensed form whilst indicating that he is abridging.

Economy of words is also practised in those fairly frequent cases in which an alternative ritual act is mentioned after the one that is obviously recommended in the first place, e.g. ĀśvŚS. 2, 6, 24:

"If (in performing the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*) one does not know the names (of one's father, grandfather, great-grandfather one should say): 'Father, grandfather, great-grandfather'".[15]

Similarly in references to parallel rites or ritual acts: after describing in ĀśvŚS. 2, a. 4 the evening *agnihotra* the author says in 2, 4, 23: "Thus (also) in the morning", adding however some particulars regarding the morning *agnihotra* in 24f.[16] In prescribing some parallel acts the verb is often not repeated.[17] That this need not entail a dry parallelism appears for instance from ĀpŚS. 5, 3,

---

GGS. 1, 1, 12 (nominal sentences). See also LŚS. 1, 6, 31ff.; 1, 7, 10; ĀśvGS. 1, 3, 1; 9; 1, 11, 4 etc. etc.

[10] E.g. Karka on KŚS. 1, 6, 16; 1, 8, 8; 46; 7, 2, 1; Mahadevaśāstrī on HŚS. 24, 8, 37.

[11] Cf. SCHARFE, Grammatical literature, in Vol. V of this History; RENOU, in JA 233, p. 122.

[12] See e.g. ĀpŚS. 3, 1, 3; 12; 3, 9, 1 (or 3, 8, 12); ĀśvŚS. 2, 7, 18.

[13] Compare also constructions such as GGS. 1, 1, 16; 1, 4, 20.

[14] See above, chapter II, 1, n. 23. For the repetitions in the *ekāha* sections of ŚŚS. see LOKESH CHANDRA, ed., p. V.

[15] Other examples: ĀśvŚS. 2, 1, 31f.; BhŚS. 1, 25, 12; 2, 1, 2; 2, 15, 10. Sometimes in a separate *sūtra:* BhŚS. 1, 1, 3; 6; 8; 1, 25, 3; ĀpŚS. 1, 9, 3; 1, 10, 19; 1, 14, 11; 2, 3, 12 etc. See also BhŚS. 4, 4, 10ff.; ĀpŚS. 1, 12, 15; 4, 3, 8f.

[16] Other examples: BhŚS. 1, 24, 6; ĀpŚS. 3, 1, 3; 12; 5, 9, 2.

[17] E.g. BhŚS. 4, 2, 1ff.; LŚS. 2, 9, 3; ĀśvGS. 1, 11, 9; 1, 12, 4f.

3ff.[18] Yet, a complete and circumstantial account of what should happen is often needed and then the authors are not averse to *sūtras* such as LŚS. 1, 2, 17:

> "When the king (i.e. Soma) has been bought, the *subrahmaṇya* should go to the north of the *soma* vehicle and, after having taken in his hand a leafy branch of the *śamī* or *palāśa* tree, take his stand between the two shafts";[19]

to following closely upon their *saṃhitā* or *brāhmaṇa* or even to elaborating a passage quoted from a *brāhmaṇa*;[20] or, when they aim at exactness, to repeating, in the same subsection, an injunction three times.[21] A few passages enter into so many particulars or treat some important ceremony so elaborately that they provide ground for believing them to be narrative descriptions amplified with *vidhis* and *mantras*. Thus some authors give a fairly faithful impression of the horse sacrifice.[22]

Absence, or at least infrequency of explications or justifications contributes much to brevity. Whereas TS. 6, 6, 10, 1, after using the verb "(he) drew (a cup or cups of *soma*)" twice in connexion with the institution of the ritual in the mythical past, has it three times in the present: "he draws (the *soma*) when it has been pressed . . .; he draws (it) with the mind; he draws it with (a vessel) . . .", ĀpŚS. 12, 12, 5 confines itself to the statement: "he draws the *soma* juice . . .".[23]

As observed earlier explicative or justificatory *sūtras* or clauses are however not entirely lacking. Explications are sometimes inserted, no doubt mainly to inform the future officiant that a name or term must be associated with a definite ritual act or a definite part of the sacrificial ground. E.g. ĀśvŚS. 1, 1, 6f.:

> *cātvālaṃ cātvālavatsu. etat tīrtham ity ācakṣate* "In (the case of rites) requiring a *cātvāla* (a definite hole in the ground) (the *hotar* goes to the fireplace west of) the *cātvāla*. This (way) is called *tīrtha*".[24]

Thus an author may insert a piece of technical information, BhŚS. 7, 2, 6:

---

[18] *kṛttikāsu brāhmaṇa ādadhīta, mukhyo brahmavarcasī bhavati . . .; rohiṇyām ādhāya sarvān rohān rohati. mṛgaśīrṣe brahmavarcasakāmo . . ., yaḥ purā bhadras san pāpīyān syāt sa punarvasvoḥ* etc.

[19] Similarly, BŚS. 6, 16: 173, 19; ĀpŚS. 10, 28, 3 (see Caland's note) etc.; cf. Parpola, Ś. L. D. 1, 2, p. 43.

[20] E.g. BŚS. 14, 24: 193, 17ff., quoting TB. 1, 4, 4, 1ff.

[21] E.g. ĀpŚS. 19, 26, 4ff. For a superfluity borrowed from the *brāhmaṇa*: ĀpŚS. 4, 16, 2f.

[22] ĀśvŚS. 10, 6ff.; ŚŚS. 16, 1ff.; 16, 18, 10ff. See also Hillebrandt, ŚŚS. ed. I, p. XV; Rit., p. 149. For an explicative section see e.g. ĀgnGS. 2, 4, 12.

[23] See also ĀpŚS. 9, 3, 5—16: TB. 3, 7, 3; MŚS. 1, 8, 5, 18: MS. 3, 10, 3; Renou, in JA 251, p. 176, quoting Kumārila, Tantrav. on 1, 3, 13.

[24] For other 'definitions' see e.g. KŚS. 15, 5, 7ff. explaining the vague term *tārpya* "a garment of a particular vegetable substance" by "linen", "made of the plant *triparṇi*" etc.; BhŚS. 3, 15, 8 "Viṣṇu indeed is sacrificial worship *(yajña)*"; 12, 4, 11; ĀpŚS. 22, 2, 6ff.; GGS. 1, 5, 7. Part of these are introductory, e.g. BhŚS. 5, 19, 1; ŚGS. 3, 10, 1; or enumerative: BhŚS. 5, 19, 1; 7, 1, 5; GGS. 1, 2, 8; HGS. 1, 12, 11.

"the measurements of the sacrificial post are from one *aratni* to thirty-three *aratnis*";

a lexicographical explanation, BhŚS. 10, 6, 5ff.:

"One arranges . . . the *kurīra* on the head of the (sacrificer's) wife. *Kurīra* is said to be a net. It is made of black wool of a living animal. Thus is it known";[25]

a characterization, GGS. 1, 1, 18:

". . . or he may kindle another fire . . . that is pure, but it does not bring prosperity";

further information or a more precise explanation, e.g. ĀpŚS. 2, 16, 1f.:

"They proceed (to perform the ritual acts) without speaking unsuitably (i.e. profane words). (That means,) 'When (the *adhvaryu*) is about to call out, he should not speak (anything) else than the 'calling out' . . .'";[26]

an indication of the purpose or result of a rite; ĀpŚS. 7, 1, 1; 8, 1, 1:

"Who performs the animal sacrifice conquers all celestial states *(loka)*"; "Undecaying is the merit of the one who performs the seasonal sacrifices";[27]

a motivation or a closing remark, e.g. GGS. 1, 2, 30; ĀpGS. 6, 14, 12:

"For if he does otherwise, he remains impure"; "(Then) she will give birth to a son".

or a piece of more or less general information.[28] That means also that the regular order of the ritual injunctions is sometimes interrupted by general remarks or directions, or by references to individual applications of a rule or to some allied subject. Āśvalāyana's explanation of the *hautram* (the office of the *hotar* cum suis) is at ŚS. 2, 13, 6 and 2, 16, 21ff. interrupted by a notice of the duty of the *adhvaryu* or the sacrificer; 3, 6, 3–7 contain general remarks interrupting the course of the directions.[29] Occasionally an author even wants to refute an opponent or to enter into controversial argumentation. In that case Kātyāyana is already acquainted with the stereotyped construction with *iti ced* of the later commentators and philosophers.[30] BhŚS. 10, 10, 4 rejects a prescription of other teachers bluntly: "One should not do this in that way" *(tad u tathā na kuryāt)*.[31] An instance of syllogistic argumentation occurs at ĀśvGS. 1, 20, 11:

"The student should put on a piece of wood silently. Silence indeed belongs to Prajāpati. The student belongs to Prajāpati".[32]

---

[25] Also BhŚS. 13, 18, 2.

[26] Also BhŚS. 10, 6, 9.

[27] Compare also BhŚS. 5, 16, 2; ĀpŚS. 1, 1, 9; GGS. 3, 10, 2.

[28] E.g. BhŚS. 2, 1, 10; 5, 20, 4; 5, 21, 8f.; 7, 12, 14; GGS. 1, 2, 4.

[29] Compare also cases such as GGS. 1, 4, 22; 1, 5, 12. One of the statements in KŚS. 15, 1, 1ff. is followed by an ablative expressing the reason: *iṣṭisomapaśavo bhinnatantrāḥ kālabhedāt.*

[30] KŚS. 1, 8, 5f.; see A. Bloch, in Mélanges Renou, p. 150.

[31] Similarly ŚB. 6, 1, 2, 31 etc.

[32] Gonda, V. L., p. 375; V. M. Apte, in NIA 3, p. 152. See also Kashikar, S. Ś., p. 78; 145.

The individual *sūtras* are often different in length. Beside very short ones — e.g. BhŚS. 2, 3, 7 "the rest (is) similar"[33]—, sometimes occurring in strings— e.g. KŚS. 15, 4, 21—35, interrupted by only two longer ones—there are *sūtras* of considerable length including many *mantras*.[34] Some *sūtras* consist entirely of *mantras*.[35] Whereas the longer *sūtras* often contain prescriptions concerning parallel acts or enumerations;[36] complicated injunctions;[37] double or threefold prescriptions[38]—e.g. ĀgnivGS. 1, 1: 3, 5ff. mentioning the necessaries of the three Aryan classes—; special circumstances, e.g. GGS. 1, 1, 24:

> "Before the time has come for setting the fire in a blaze, he should fetch in the evening and in the morning from a hidden place the water with which (the ritual acts) are to be performed";

contain more than one *mantra* relating to more than one act;[39] or, the well-known strings of absolutives which are so characteristic of Sanskrit prose,[40] a good many of the shorter *sūtras* are syntactically incomplete, e.g. ĀśvŚS. 1, 4, 2f.:

> *bahiṣpavamānāt pratyetya some. prasṛpya hotā* "Having returned from the *bahiṣpavamāna* (hymn of praise) in the *soma* ritual (and) after having performed the procession the *hotar* (sits down again)".

Here and elsewhere two consecutive *sūtras* constitute a syntactic unit. However, cases of anacoluthon are in some texts not very rare.[41]

Other *sūtras* combine the utmost brevity with a certain elegance and a felicitous comprehensiveness.[42] Many of these are nominal sentences devoid of any superfluity but sometimes enigmatic to the uninitiated; BhŚS. 1, 1, 16:

> *uttaraupacāro vihāraḥ* "(in the) area of the sacred fires (movements made in) performing ritual acts (are made) towards the north".[43]

As to idioms and particular modes of expression, beside ancient phrases and

---

[33] Also BhŚS. 6, 13, 7; ĀpŚS. 1, 3, 4: ĀśvGS. 4, 2, 5 *(gām)*; 6; 7; 4, 4, 18ff.; ŚGS. 4, 2, 2—4; 6—8; 4, 4, 5—9; 4, 7 etc.

[34] E.g. BhŚS. 1, 24, 5; 2, 14, 8; ĀpŚS. 1, 5, 5 (4); 1, 7, 13 (7); 1, 22, 2.

[35] E.g. BhŚS. 3, 10, 2; 3, 11, 1.

[36] Cf. also SINGH, K. Ś. S., p. 139; see e.g. KŚS. 7, 6, 14; 15, 5, 30; ĀśvGS. 2, 4, 12.

[37] E.g. BhŚS. 1, 26, 10; ĀpŚS. 11, 21, 4; 12, 13, 9.

[38] Cf. also BhŚS. 9, 4, 1; 13, 22, 12.

[39] E.g. MŚS. 2, 2, 2, 37; KŚS. 2, 7, 4; 2, 8, 19.

[40] See RENOU, in JA 251, p. 177. E.g. BhŚS. 1, 24, 2; 9, 10, 9; ĀpŚS. 1, 1, 2; 11, 21, 4; 12, 9, 10; 12, 13, 9; KŚS. 2, 1, 11; GGS. 1, 2, 5; 32; 3, 4, 24f.; PGS. 1, 1, 2; HGS. 2, 15, 7. Cf. also GGS. 1, 1, 7—9. In these constructions the personal forms indicate the last act or process, the absolutives (of 'temporal concatenation') the anterior ones. Whereas the number of the former is reduced, the latter increase.

[41] E.g. BGPS 2, 5, 4; cf. PANSE, in VIJ 4, p. 48.

[42] For instance such definitions as KŚS. 12, 1, 5f. *āsata upayantīti sattraliṅgaṃ yajata ity ahīnasya. ubhayato 'tirātraṃ sattram upariṣṭād ahīnasya*; BhŚS. 1, 1, 2.

[43] Some more random examples: BhŚS. 5, 2, 5; 7, 1, 5; 8, 3, 9; KŚS. 1, 2, 3; 1, 4, 8; 9. The sentence type KŚS. 4, 3, 2 *darśapūrṇamāsadharmā iṣṭipaśuṣu sāmarthyāt* is not lacking; 16, 1, 1.

constructions traditionally preserved—e.g. the partitive genitive[44]—we find such products of the effort to be as concise as possible as for instance KŚS. 3, 7, 16 *prāsya tṛṇādi* "after having thrown away the grass and (performed) the other (acts prescribed)". Numerous expressions moreover attest not only to thorough familiarity with various techniques[45] but also to a considerable proficiency in expressing complicated processes with great precision by means of technical terms—e.g. BŚS. 3, 5: 73, 10 *abhidyotayati* "he illuminates the offering by means of an ignited blade of straw"; ĀpŚS. 12, 6, 1 *vyānayati* "he pours out (the water contained in the cup of the *hotar*) into (that of the *maitrāvaruṇa* and) conversely".

Another characteristic contributing to the conciseness of these works is the occurrence of cross references, almost always to preceding parts of the text.[46] Among the 'formules de prétérition'[47] used to give the student to understand that some instruction that has been imparted is not repeated are *vyākhyāta(m)* "explained"—e.g. BhŚS. 4, 7, 6 *vyākhyātam ājyavekṣaṇam* "the gazing at the clarified butter has (already) been explained" (viz. in 2, 6, 11)[48]—, *ukta(m)* "spoken of, discussed"—e.g. ĀśvŚS. 3, 1, 7 *uktam agnipraṇayanam* "the bringing forward (of the fire) has (already) been mentioned" (viz. in 2, 17)—or formulaic sentences such as BhŚS. 5, 21, 6 *siddham iṣṭiḥ saṃtiṣṭhate* "the sacrifice is completed in the established (demonstrated) way";[49] BGŚS. 5, 1, 37 *śeṣaṃ pūrvavat* "the rest is as before".[50] When the reference is to a long or complicated ritual some repetition of words may nevertheless be needed or desirable.[51] Occasionally such formulaic expressions are to inform the student that the preceding rite is an archetype; e.g. ĀśvŚS. 2, 1, 1:

paurṇamāseneṣṭipaśusomā upadiṣṭāḥ "by the sacrifice of full moon the *iṣṭis*, animal and *soma* sacrifices are taught (also)".[52]

---

[44] E.g. BŚS. 15, 19: 224, 9; ĀpŚS. 1, 11, 2; KauśS. 18, 27.

[45] RENOU, H. L. S., p. 56. Were expressions such as ĀśvŚS. 5, 5, 9 *ākāśavatībhir aṅgulībhiḥ* "with the fingers extended" images characteristic of the *sūtra* style (Renou) or more generally current?

[46] The *adhrigu* litany in ĀśvŚS. 3, 3, 1 is already mentioned in 3, 2, 10 and 11. AśvGS. 1, 5, 1 *yathoktaṃ purastāt* refers to ĀśvŚS. 9, 3, 20.

[47] RENOU, in JA 251, p. 178.

[48] See also BhŚS. 4, 16, 1; 6, 3, 6; 6, 18, 6; 8, 11, 18; 8, 24, 2; ĀpŚS. 22, 27, 2f.; HŚS. 23, 4, 35f. At 6, 17, 9 the author refers to a section in his book which is to follow (8, 2, 15f.), indicating it by a name; 14, 11, 1 refers to 14, 13, 14. These places may be of interest in connexion with the problem of transpositions of chapters or sections; see e.g. CALAND, on ĀpŚS. 15, 1, 4. For gazing see J. GONDA, Eye and gaze in the Veda, Amsterdam Acad. 1969.

[49] Cf. MŚS. 5, 1, 4, 9; 7, 1, 1, 4; BGŚS. 3, 6, 5 . . . *siddham* "(the ceremonies beginning with . . .) have been established, are known".

[50] Cf. also KŚS. 3, 7, 16; MŚS. 6, 1, 4, 5 *samānam anyat*; BGŚS. 5, 1, 39; 41 *śeṣaṃ samānam (bhavati)*.

[51] E.g. ĀgnGS. 2, 1, 1: 45, 6; 2: 46, 7; 2, 1, 5: 50, 19; 2, 4, 1: 60, 7 *yathā purastād brāhmaṇān annena parivişya puṇyāhaṃ svastyayanam ṛddhim iti vācayitvā* . . .

[52] That means that the elements which these rites have in common need not be discussed again.

Such a piece of information may be followed by a restriction: ĀpŚS. 8, 3, 1:

"... as in the animal sacrifice, except the *praiṣas* (directions given by the *maitrāvaruṇa*, one of his assistants, to the *hotar*)",

or by the statement "the difference is only this" (BhŚS. 8, 2, 8).

The effort to be concise does not prevent a *sūtrakāra* from using constructions which, though at first sight somewhat cumbrous, serve a special purpose[53] or repeat a word for the sake of clearness.[54] Very seldom, it is true, an author who is otherwise predisposed to deviations indulges in the luxury of, for instance, an elaborated comparison.[55] On the other hand, part of the syntactic irregularities[56] are perhaps due to the wish to compress a maximum of information into a minimum of words. As a rule each act or ritual particular is prescribed separately. *Sūtras* containing one verb or one sentence are normal. Whereas those of the type ĀpŚS. 10, 15, 9 are fairly frequent:

"He lies south of the *āhavanīya*, turned towards the east, not lying on his face nor on his back; nor does he turn away from the fire",[57]

sūtras consisting of three complete and separate sentences[58] may—like for instance combinations of an incomplete clause (participle construction) and a complete sentence—create the impression of looseness.

The style of these works is often extremely stereotyped. The authors are generally apt to repeat always the same or similar phrases and a limited number of constructions built according to fixed patterns. The diction of Lāṭyāyana, for instance, "is systematically stereotyped: wherever possible, the same word order, phrases and expressions are used throughout the work".[59] Parallel units (word groups, sentences) are therefore not rare. In cases such as BhŚS. 5, 1, 8f. this causes the repetition of three words: "he who desires *(yaḥ kāmayeta)* ... should set up the sacred fires *(ādadhīta)* ...".[60] In many other cases however

[53] E.g. BhŚS. 1, 1, 5 (*yad ahaḥ* emphasized); 1, 2, 9; 13; ŚŚS. 5, 19, 1f.

[54] E.g. BhŚS. 3, 8, 13.

[55] See BhGPS. 1, 6, 11ff. (*ślokas;* quotation); cf. A. B. Keith, in JRAS 1909, p. 752.

[56] Cf. e.g. Kashikar, BhŚS. ed. I, p. LXIV, who however draws also attention to some superfluities; Caland, VaikhŚS. ed., p. XIX.

[57] For shortenings of the type BhŚS. 1, 1, 10f. *yajñopavīty eva daiveṣu karmasu bhavati. prācīnāvītī pitṛyeṣu* see e.g. 5, 2, 2ff.; 11, 3, 11; cf. also 1, 1, 13 etc.

[58] E.g. ĀpŚS. 10, 15, 15; 5, 5, 10; cf. also 12, 12, 3; MŚS. 2, 2, 1, 11 etc. According to Singh, K. Ś. S., p. 28 this type does not occur in Kātyāyana.

[59] Parpola, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 28. See e.g. BhŚS. 2, 2, 6; 12, 2, 2; 6; 13, 11, 18 (= 13, 13, 10); 13, 13, 4; 13, 17, 1; HŚS. 15, 4, 26 (34; 44; 45); 48 (49); 17, 1, 37 and many other places.

[60] See also J. Gonda, Stylistic repetition in the Veda, Amsterdam Acad. 1959, p. 38; 65; 117 and passim; Renou, in JA 251, p. 177. Other instances: BSS. 3, 4: 72, 3ff.; 16, 6: 252, 3ff.; BhŚS. 2, 4, 4ff.; 12, 2, 3f.; ĀpŚS. 10, 16, 8f.; 18, 13, 14ff.; 20, 4, 1ff.; 21, 11, 2ff.; BGPS. 2, 4, 9ff.; 2, 5, 1ff.; GGS. 1, 2, 2f.; ĀśvGS. 3, 1, 3; ĀgnivGS. 1, 1, 1: 4, 7ff. Compare also successions of *mantras* such as BhŚS. 12, 19, 9ff. With variation (chiasmus) BhŚS. 5, 2, 9f. With much repetition e.g. BGPS. 2, 5, 8; 10 (interrupted). In BGS. 2, 10, 2—8 the same schema and the same words are seven times repeated.

a parallelism is shortened or reduced to what is absolutely necessary, the common elements being expressed only once.[61]

Yet the authors enjoy, within the limits of the literary genre, a certain freedom in presenting the subject matter and in formulating the ritual rules. They can, for instance, by a chiastic structure of a sentence—which, it is true, may make its appearance almost automatically—introduce a touch of variation; BhŚS. 10, 16, 11:

> "With 'for offspring thee' he collects the remaining (stalks), folds together the borders of the garment and binds (the entire stock) together with a linen turban with 'for vital air thee'".[62]

Mention has already been made of the fact that the *sūtrakāras* do not always communicate the injunctions and the *mantras* belonging to them in the same order.[63] In principle the *mantras* can be placed anywhere; thus Kātyāyana inserts the *yajus* formulas either in the beginning or in the middle or at the end of the *sūtras*.[64] Exceptions to what in a definite text is made a rule may have resulted from a tendency to chiasmus.[65] Even the well-known 'rhetorical question' or instruction by means of question and answer is in Baudhāyana's corpus a usual device.[66]

Some cases of direct speech or short dialogues occur in *brāhmaṇa*like portions.[67]

Whereas the *brāhmaṇas* normally begin or end their expositions abruptly or change their subject without warning their readers, the didactic *sūtras* are not devoid of—generally brief and severe—superscriptions, initial or transitional formulas, closing paragraphs and so on. This practice is however neither constant nor uniform. There is for instance no uniformity in starting the expositions. Some authors come straight to the point; LŚS. 1, 1, 1; JŚS. 1, 1:

> "Now henceforth when there is no specification of the prescriptive rule, it governs all sacrifices";[68] "when the one who announces the *soma* sacrifice (that is, the person commissioned to engage officiants) has arrived, he (the *udgātar*) answers (him)";

---

[61] E.g. BhŚS. 13, 11, 7f.; ĀpŚS. 1, 2, 7; 2, 13, 10; 20, 16, 1f.; GGS. 1, 4, 4; 8; 9; 1, 5, 6; ĀśvGS. 3, 8, 11ff.

[62] Also BhŚS. 2, 17, 7; 4, 22, 12; 13, 13, 14f.; ŚŚS. 4, 2, 2f.; GGS. 1, 4, 2; 19; ĀgnGS. 1, 1, 1: 2, 5; cf. cases such as BGPS. 1, 16, 48f. See A. Beth, Variatieverschijnselen in het Oud-Indisch, Thesis Utrecht 1943, p. 33 (chiasmus in GGS and VaikhGS.); Renou, in JA 251, p. 184.

[63] See above, p. 520.

[64] Cf. KŚS. 2, 5, 17; 7, 9, 1; 2, 7, 2.

[65] E.g. BhŚS. 1, 3, 1f.; 8f.; 2, 5, 6f. (in one *sūtra*) 1, 24, 2; 3 (cf. 2, 1, 1); 1, 24, 11; compare the formulas in 1, 19, 1f.

[66] BŚS. 24, 2: 186, 3 (in succession); BGPS. 1, 5, 1f.; 2, 2, 2; 13: BGŚS. 1, 8, 2; 4, 9, 1; 4, 10, 1; BhŚS. 9, 6, 3.

[67] See e.g. BŚS. 13, 20 etc. mentioned below. For Vādhūla see Caland, in AO 4, p. 11; 6, p. 105.

[68] For *paribhāṣās* see above, ch. II, 4. Cf. also BŚS. 1, 1.

others begin with an opening *sūtra* introducing the subject which is dealt with first, e.g. BhŚS. 1, 1, 1:

"We shall explain the full and new moon sacrifices",[69]

or their whole Sūtra work, e.g. ŚSS. 1, 1, 1; ĀpGS. 1, 1, 1:

"We shall explain sacrificial worship"; "Now are considered the ritual acts (based on) customary practice and so on".[70]

Vārāha's exordium is exceptional,[71] 1, 1, 1:

"Man's well-being lies in the performance and knowledge of sacrificial worship. That (is what) we shall explain".

An initial *sūtra* is often ably followed by others which, while elaborating a given topic, constitute a well-knit whole. Thus KŚS. 1, 1, 1ff., after beginning:

"Now the duty and right to (perform rites)" and continuing: "The rites are accompanied by fruits (good results). Of all beings (it is the duty and a right to perform rites) without difference. Or of men (as the only beings) because they are able (to undertake rites). With the exception of the mutilated, those who are not versed in the Veda, eunuchs, (and) *śūdras*",

the author discusses a well-chosen introductory subject, viz. the eligibility for the performance of rites.[72]

Occasionally a new subject is introduced by a group of *sūtras*, e.g. BhŚS. 5, 17, 1–3 (cf. 14, 1, 1–3):

"Now we shall explain the renewing of the sacred fires. Its procedure has been explained by the setting up of the sacred fires. We shall relate only the differences",

but in most cases the formula, if there is any, is shorter: "We shall explain . . ." or "Now (follows) . . ."[73] The introductory *sūtra* may consist of one word and so be equivalent to a title: ĀśvŚS. 3, 1, 1 *paśau* "as to (in) the animal (sacrifice)".[74] Introductory definitions are not unknown, e.g. ĀpŚS. 20, 24, 1:

---

[69] See also BPMS. 1, 1, 1; HŚS. 1, 1, 1; HGS. 1, 1, 1; PGS. 1, 1, 1; KauthGS. 1, 1; ĀpŚS. 1, 1, 1, begins, like many other works, with *atha* which not only marks immediate continuation and the beginning of a new subject but is also auspicious (cf. GGSPar. 2, 9 "both *oṃ* and *atha* issued from *brahman* and that is why they are auspicious *(maṅgalau)*"); see Karka, on KŚS. 1, 1, 1; Agnisvāmin, on LŚS. 1, 1, 1.

[70] Cf. also ĀśvŚS. 1, 1, 1; GGS. 1, 1, 1; PGS. 1, 1, 1; KhGS. 1, 1, 1. For ŚGS. 1, 1, 1 see OLDENBERG, in S. B. E. XXIX, p. 12.

[71] But compare e.g. ĀpŚS. 7, 1, 1.

[72] Cf. also KŚS. 15, 1, 1ff. *rājño rājasūyaḥ. aniṣṭino vājapeyena* etc.

[73] See e.g. BhŚS. 4, 1, 1; 6, 7, 1; 6, 15, 1; 11, 21, 1; 14, 8, 1; ĀpŚS. 4, 1, 1; 5, 1, 1; HŚS. 11, 1, 1; KŚS. 4, 1, 1; 20, 1, 1; BGPS, 2, 1, 39; 45; HGS. 2, 9, 1.

[74] Notice however the continuation in 3, 1, 2. The commentator regards this as an *adhikāra* "head or governing rule or *sūtra* extending over the following *sūtras* up to a certain limit"; also "subject dealt with" (not much in evidence in the ritual texts). See L. RENOU, Terminologie grammaticale du sanskrit, Paris 1942, I, p. 11; II, p. 7; and in JA 233, p. 123; 251, p. 177. Similarly, ĀśvŚS. 3, 9, 1 *sautrāmaṇyāṃ;* 2 *āśvinasārasvataindrāḥ paśavaḥ*. Other examples ĀśvŚS. 7, 1, 1; ŚŚS. 15, 9, 1 (in the nominative); KŚS. 22, 1, 1 *athaikāhaḥ*.

"The human sacrifice is a *soma* ritual of five days".[75]

A new subject or section is very often introduced by *atha* . . .[76] or *athātaḥ*:[77] HGS. 1, 14, 8 *athātaḥ paṇyasiddhiḥ* "now (follows the sacrifice for procuring) prosperity in trade". Transitions are sometimes marked by two successive *sūtras*, such as HGS. 1, 9, 1f.:

"After he has studied the Veda, the bath (which signifies the end of his studentship). We shall explain that (bath)",[78]

or by one *sūtra*: ĀśvGS. 1, 1, 1, indicating that what follows is a continuation of the Śrautasūtra.

Closing formulas are not unknown; with *iti*—ĀśvŚS. 11, 7, 20 *iti gavām ayanam* "Thus (so far) the *gavām ayanam*"—which elsewhere concludes a series of *mantras* that belong together, e.g. ĀśvŚS. 3, 7, 15 (introduced by 3, 7, 2) or enumerative statements (BGPS. 1, 1, 23)—or with a retrospective pronoun "by this . . . has been explained".[79] An instance of the formula ". . . comes to an end" occurs at BhŚS. 14, 19, 15 *saṃtiṣṭhate tṛtīyasavanam* at the end of the description of the *soma* services.[80] Sometimes the last words are repeated to mark off a section.[81] So do concluding statements such as BGŚS. 1, 15, 7 and 1, 16, 43 "These are the words of the reverend Bodhāyana" or BhŚS. 6, 14, 18 "One should offer the *agnihotra* thus described throughout" by themselves.

Instances of what may be called circular composition are not entirely absent: at BGPS. 1, 1, 2 the discussion of studentship is announced ("we shall explain . . ."), at 17 it is concluded with "it has been explained".[82]

The treatment of a ritual may be preceded by or begin with preliminaries or introductory remarks.[83] The description of the rite proper or of particular acts is often introduced by an indication of the more or less special circumstances, e.g. BhŚS. 4, 19, 9 "if the sacrificer is on a journey, (the *adhvaryu*) should . . . offer". In BGŚS. 2, 12, 1–3 there is an introductory reference to the circumstances of four lines (two *sūtras*) before the new subject (remarriage) is broached. References to special circumstances may be inserted anywhere.[84] Indications of the proper time or place, of the requisites needed etc. usually precede the

---

[75] Also ĀpŚS. 20, 25, 3; cf. cases such as 22, 24, 1.

[76] Cf. BŚS. 18, 9; BhŚS. 8, 13, 1; 9, 11, 1; GGS. 1, 4, 1; 1, 5, 1; HGS. 2, 5, 1; ŚGS. 3, 11, 1. See above, n. 69.

[77] Also ĀgnGS. 2, 1, 1 (with a nominative); 2, 3, 2 (followed by "we shall explain"); 2, 4, 6; 2, 4, 8; KauthGS. 1, 2; HGS. 1, 15, 2; 2, 1, 1.

[78] Cf. also ĀśvŚS. 3, 7, 1f.; BGPS. 2, 1, 44f.; cf. also MŚS. 8, 18, 1.

[79] E.g. BGPS. 1, 12, 18; 2, 1, 27. Without a pronoun e.g. BGŚS. 1, 13, 18; BGPS. 2, 1, 48.

[80] Also BhŚS. 7, 23, 8; ĀpŚS. 18, 22, 20; 20, 23, 13.

[81] E.g. BhŚS. 6, 14, 18; 6, 18, 17; 8, 25, 14; ŚGS. 3, 14, 6; GGS. 1, 4, 31; ĀgnGS. 2, 2, 1; 2, 4, 9. Compare also GGS. 1, 1, 22; BGPS. 1, 5, 10.

[82] Also BGPS. 2, 1, 45: 48; 2, 2, 13: 18; BGŚS. 1, 6, 1: 3; 2, 7, 1: 9.

[83] E.g. ĀśvŚS. 3, 1; ĀpŚS. 15, 1, 1f.

[84] E.g. BhŚS. 6, 14, 4; 7, 13, 8; 7, 16, 6; 7, 18, 6; 9, 12, 6; ĀpŚS. 2, 6, 4; 2, 11, 2; cf. also statements such as BhŚS. 5, 8, 14; GGS. 1, 4, 22; HGS. 1, 14, 1.

statements about the ritual acts to be performed.[85] Addenda are sometimes[86] needed to impart some useful knowledge which could not well be inserted elsewhere. The end of a chapter or section is also a suitable place for the communication of different opinions.[87]

As to the frequent references to and quotations from authorities one should distinguish between statements of—as a rule unspecified—passages of basic texts and citations from teachers. As to the former category, the authors preferably use one of the following stereotyped phrases. The formulaic "thus it is known, understood" *(iti vijñāyate)*[88] generally introduces a quotation that should be regarded as cited or derived from the *śruti*, although verbs of "speaking"—e.g. *ity uktam*—may suffice also.[89] References to other traditions are made by "some (authorities)"—or, e.g., "the Vājasaneyins"—"hand down traditionally" *(samāmananti)*[90] or simply by *iti* and a name.[91] Quotations can be introduced by "it says; it is written" *(atha vai bhavati)*[92]; by "Now they relate" or "they cite (as an instance)" *(athāpy udāharanti)*;[93] or by "he (it) declares, mentions" *(tad eṣābhivadati)* etc.[94] In contradistinction to the *brāhmaṇas* which often quote statements and practices of other teachers the *kalpasūtras*—with the exception of Baudhāyana and Lāṭyāyana—do no longer consider it fashionable to mention individual authorities by name; they refer to "some" *(eke)*[95] or to the existing literature or speak, in drawing attention to different practices, of "alternatives" *(vikalpa)*.[96] If an authority is mentioned by name the most usual formulation is oratio recta, followed by *iti* and the name, but other constructions (accusative, adverbial expression etc.) are possible also.[97]

[85] E.g. ĀśvŚS. 2, 1, 10ff.; 2, 9, 3; 2, 14, 3; ŚGS. 3, 11, 2; GGS. 1, 6, 1; 2, 8, 1; ĀgnGS. 2, 1, 1; 2, 3, 1; cf. also ĀśvŚS. 2, 1, 16.

[86] E.g. ĀpŚS. 3, 14, 8—14. Cf. also v. GELDER, MŚS. ed., p. 5.

[87] E.g. ĀpŚS. 5, 29, 14; 6, 15, 16; KŚS. 4, 2, 49 (option).

[88] See e.g. BhŚS. 2, 3, 1; 2, 16, 1; 3, 9, 10; 14; 3, 15, 8; 5, 17, 6; 8, 25, 14 (in part of these cases the source is not known); ĀpŚS. 1, 1, 9 (referring to TB. 3, 2, 1, 2); 1, 2, 11; 19, 1, 14; ĀśvŚS. 2, 17, 5; 3, 13, 14; BGŚS. 1, 11, 7; 4, 3, 3; ĀgnGS. 3, 4, 3: 136, 4.

[89] E.g. ĀpŚS. 2, 12, 3; 3, 6, 10; 7, 1, 13 (18, referring to TS. 6, 3, 3, 4); for *āha* see ĀpŚS. 5, 3, 15; "here (as to this) they say" *(tatraitad āhuḥ)* GGS. 1, 2, 10. ĀśvGS. 1, 13, 1 *upaniṣadi garbhalambhanam* "In the *upaniṣad* (the author deals with) . . ." may perhaps refer to the KauṣUp. (APTE, in NIA 3, p. 102); ĀśvGS. 1, 21, 3.

[90] E.g. ĀpŚS. 1, 2, 6; 1, 8, 7.

[91] E.g. ĀpŚS. 2, 9, 8 *iti vājasaneyakam*. Or *iti* without a name: ĀgnGS. 1, 3, 1.

[92] E.g. BŚS. 14, 24: 193, 17; 14, 25: 195, 15; BGŚS. 4, 8, 1; 4, 11, 1.

[93] E.g. BGŚS. 1, 11, 9; 4, 4, 19; BGPS. 1, 10, 5 (introducing a *śloka*); BPMS. 1, 1, 5; 8; 1, 3, 2; ĀgnGS. 3, 10, 4: 174, 5 (in *ślokas*).

[94] E.g. BGPS. 2, 6, 13. The quotation from AVŚ. (1, 11, 4) in PGS. 1, 16, 2 is only followed by *iti*.

[95] For the phrase *athaikeṣāṃ vijñāyate* see BhŚS. 9, 6, 9; for a repeated *eke* e.g. BŚS. 27, 12: 339, 4ff.

[96] For this term see e.g. LŚS. 4, 5, 1; ĀśvŚS. 1, 12, 5; 2, 2, 12; 3, 2, 14; KŚS. 1, 4, 14; JGS. 1, 17, 1.

[97] For many particulars see A. PARPOLA, On the quotations . . . in Lāṭyāyana

The wording of the quotations is the *sūtrakāra*'s, because he had to adapt the statements of the teachers quoted. There are also self-quotations.[98]

As already observed by Caland[99] there are in Baudhāyana's Śrautasūtra some narratives of the historical-legendary type so often found in the *brāhmaṇas*.[100] At 17, 45 the author, dealing elaborately with the so-called *naiṣṭyayana* oblations inserts the following story:

> "A brahmin who was desirous of *soma* met on his way with a white, red-eyed (person) whose head was broken and who was dripping (with blood). He said to him: 'How could I come to know you, venerable man ?' He answered: 'I am king Soma. A wretched *adhvaryu* who did not know the *naiṣṭyayanas* has pressed me out. When a wretched *adhvaryu* who does not know the *naiṣṭyayanas* presses me out I shall certainly drip (blood). A certain brahmin, So-and-so by name, is acquainted with the *naiṣṭyayanas*. I shall go to him. He will restore the (normal) colour (to my face)".

This legend is followed by ritual indications, the *naiṣṭyayana* formulas and statements of the good or bad results awaiting those who perform the rite or neglect that duty. Other legends are found in BŚS. 18, 26 in connexion with the *vrātyastoma;* 18, 28 in connexion with the *upahavya* sacrifice; 18, 38f. on Keśin Dalbha's son who performed the *apaciti* sacrifice and elsewhere. Some legendary passages are also incorporated in the Āgniveśya-Gṛhyasūtra.[101]

Cases of polemics are not entirely absent. At BGS. 2, 5, 41ff. a different opinion is not only stated but also provided with a motive:

> "Then the boy (who is to be initiated) eats after having taken from the cooked food (while pronouncing the formulas . . .). Here some eat before the (imparting of the) *sāvitrī* (ṚV. 3, 62, 10), saying that (the) food is *brahman*. That however one should not do in that way. He should not eat as long as the *sāvitrī* has not been pronounced (recited, learnt . . .)."

Verses, though foreign to the technical nature of the *śrauta* manuals, are not absent either.[102] Leaving ŚŚS. 12, 14—24—where in a discussion of the recitations of the *hotrakas* a long series of specified ṛgvedic hymns is followed by the Kuntāpa hymn (12, 14, 1—16, 5), the four stanzas of Parikṣit and other verses[103] —out of account, mention may be made of five laudatory stanzas all of them

---

and Drāhyāyaṇa, in Vol. Raghu Vira, p. 69, and p. 74. See e.g. LŚS. 1, 1, 25f. Simply *iti* and the name e.g. BŚS. 7, 4: 205, 4; 11, 2: 66, 5; 16, 13: 261, 16; LŚS. 1, 6, 14; without *iti* LŚS. 1, 4, 18; 19; 26; 2, 1, 3; for the genitive of the name LŚS. 1, 4, 13; 15; for the type *tatra gautamīyam* (sc. *matam*) 1, 4, 2. It seems that generally the view mentioned first is accepted by Lāṭyāyana, if he has not stated his own opinion.

[98] E.g. BGParS. 1, 1, 18 (referring with *iti* to 1, 1, 1); see above.

[99] Caland, Über . . . Baudhāyana, p. 19 etc. (with some German translations).

[100] See Gonda, V. L., p. 384.

[101] See G. M. Panse, in VIJ 4, p. 48.

[102] Cf. L. Renou, Les vers insérés dans la prose védique, in Asiatica, Festschrift Friedrich Weller, Leipzig 1954, p. 528, esp. p. 532. Some prose formulas are more or less metrical, e.g. Kauś. 20, 6; 22, 2ff. On the metrical character of the verses see Oldenberg, in S. B. E. XXX, p. XI and XXXV.

[103] Cf. Caland on ŚŚS. 12, 16, 5.

introduced by the formula "As to this a sacrificial stanza *(yajñagāthā)* is recited"[104] in 16, 9 of the same work. They are almost identical with verses occurring in ŚB. 13, 5, 4 and cannot be disconnected from similar passages in the older *(brāhmaṇa)* literature.[105] The chapter 16, 9 concluding the section on the horse sacrifice of which it mentions some variations, is no doubt a supplement. There is further, again in Śāṅkhāyana (15, 17–27), the Śunaḥśepa episode containing a number of stanzas.[106] Yajñagāthās,—no doubt handed down and occasionally inserted better to remember or inculcate an important point in the argument—occur also in the Āśvalāyana-Śrautasūtra[107] and rarely elsewhere.[108] With the *gṛhya* books it is otherwise. Already before the time of their compilation there must have existed metrical explanations or résumés of certain points concerning the domestic ritual[109] and man's religious obligations in general.[110] This seems for instance to appear from the existence of stanzas that, being more or less common property, occur in several texts.[111] Those that are inserted in the texts are known as *gāthās* as well as *ślokas*.[112] A *yajñagāthā* is for instance quoted in ĀśvGS. 1, 3, 10 at the end of a section; summarizing what has been said in the prose text and repeating some words that occur in 9 it enjoins the one who has to perform different domestic sacrifices to use the same sacrificial butter etc., even if the deity of these rituals is not the same.[113] At the end of the section ŚGS. 1, 10 there is a didactic *śloka* (7) in explanation of some technical terms, followed by two others stating the correct behaviour of the one who sacrifices.[114] Thus there are more versified passages part of them

---

[104] For *gāthās*, "texts that are delivered in a singing tone to the accompaniment of stringed instruments" see GONDA, V. L., p. 405 (for the term *narāśaṃsa* in 12, 14, 1 cf. p. 406) and in general P. HORSCH, Die vedische Gāthā- und Śloka-Literatur, Bern 1966, passim. Reminiscences of historical events, heroic exploits are absent; for ĀpMP. 2, 11, 12 see the speculative article by R. C. HAZRA, in ABORI 37, p. 167. For a mythical reference: HGS. 1, 11, 4.

[105] Compare Gārgya Nārāyaṇa on ĀśvŚS. 5, 5, 21: *gāthāśabdena brāhmaṇagatā ṛca ucyante.*

[106] See GONDA, V. L., p. 394.

[107] See especially ĀśvŚS. 8, 13, 31 and 5, 5, 21; (in a spurious section) 2, 12, 6.

[108] ĀpŚS. 23, 14, 16 and MŚS. 9, 5, 4, 43 (= PB. 25, 18, 5; with variants BŚS. 17, 19: 299, 6); VaitS. 4, 23 and 9, 12 using the term *śloka*, which is more often found in later works. The term *gāthā* occurs e.g. also BŚS. 16, 6: 252, 7; VārŚS. 3, 3, 3, 33; 3, 4, 1, 36; KŚS. 15, 6, 3; 20, 2, 7; ĀśvŚS. 9, 3, 11.

[109] OLDENBERG, in The Gṛhya-sūtras translated II, p. XXII.

[110] BŚS. 28, 11 is a chapter on *prāyaścittas* in *ślokas*.

[111] E.g. LGS. 1, 33 on the student who does not beg for food etc. occurs also at BDhS. 1, 2, 57 (1, 2, 4, 7). MADHUSUDAN KAUL, LGS. edition, p. 10 improbably regards these stanzas as "assuming a tinge of modernity".

[112] The latter are much more frequent in *dharmasūtras*. For stanzas found in the middle of a discussion in prose and presumably taken over from earlier sources see also R. P. KANGLE, The Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra, III, Bombay 1965, p. 33.

[113] According to V. M. Apte, in NIA 3, p. 54 borrowed from KauśS. 6, 34; rather 'common property'.

[114] One should leave out of consideration places such as MGS. 2, 14, 29 and ĀśvGS. 1, 14, 7 (dealing with the *sīmantonnayana* and quoting words to be recited

longer than one or two stanzas,[115] for instance the three stanzas ŚGS. 4, 5, 15ff. introduced by "(of this) it is also said" *(tad api bhavati)*. ĀgnGS. 2, 3, 3 and 2, 4, 7 are instances of sections that are completely or almost completely composed in verse. Traditional lore is sometimes also clothed in prose: GGS. 1, 9, 3:

> "Through the brahmin's being satiated (with sacrificial food) I become satiated (myself)",

but the circulation of these *gāthās* and *ślokas* has no doubt contributed to the occurrence, in *sūtra* texts, of arrangements of words that have the appearance of a hemistich or a quarter of a stanza.[116]

In course of time the *sūtras* tend to become more compact in composition and more terse in style.[117] The *brāhmaṇa*like *sūtra* works (Baudhāyana, Jaiminīya) are succeeded by the middle group of mixed style, Āpastamba being nearer to those which precede—thus the recapitulative absolutive *prahṛtya* in ĀpŚS. 7, 13, 7 after *praharati* "he pushes into" in 6 has been copied from the *brāhmaṇa*, TS. 6, 3, 5, 4—Śāṅkhāyana—who, e.g. at 9, 20, 1 abridges the Kauṣītakī-Brāhmaṇa (18, 5=18, 4, 33)—to those which follow. Mānava creates the impression of being still less circumstantial than Āpastamba and avoids, unlike the latter, inserting prescripts and views of other *śākhās*.[118] Lāṭyāyana is a typical work of the middle type.[119] The extremely concise *sūtra* style of the later manuals is represented by Kātyāyana. Some works lack homogeneity; as already observed, the Nidānasūtra is composed partly in a complicated, though somewhat modernized, *brāhmaṇa* style, partly in very terse *sūtra* fashion. Also in the domestic manuals there are considerable differences in length and degree of conciseness.[120] Khādira, dependent on Gobhila's work, but omitting the latter's digressions,[121] is more compact and succinct and, also because of a predilection for compounds and nominal sentences, and an aversion to long and frequent quotations, a better specimen of the true *sūtra* style. There are also interrelations between an author's concentration and the concentration of his style: attention may either be focussed on one single subject or be invited to various occasions requiring the same ritual acts.[122]

---

by two lute players; see also PGS. 1, 15, 8; ŚGS. 1, 22, 11f., and HILLEBRANDT, Rit., p. 43) because the verses mentioned here are part of the rituals described.

[115] E.g. ŚGS. 1, 1, 15; 1, 2, 5—8; BhGS. 2, 21: 53, 14; ĀgnGS. 2, 4, 5; 11; 12; BGŚS. 1, 3, 8; 3, 16, 13f.; 3, 19, 19. Some of these verses are incomplete or defective; cf. e.g. BhPGS. 1, 9, 11. For verse and prose see BhGŚS. 1, a. 16.

[116] E.g. ĀśvGS. 1, 5, 1; see HJ. SMITH, Retractationes rhythmicae, Helsinki 1951, p. 14; V. M. APTE, in NIA 3, p. 56.

[117] On the style in general see also L. RENOU, Histoire de la langue sanskrite, Lyon and Paris 1956, p. 53; the same in J. WACKERNAGEL, Altindische Grammatik, Introduction générale, Göttingen 1957, p. 15 (with the notes, p. 70); in JA 251, p. 165.

[118] Cf. VAN GELDER, Hoogaltaar, p. XIII, where some particulars.

[119] PARPOLA, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 28.

[120] Compare e.g. GGS. 2, 2, 8 with BGS. 1, 5, 27ff.

[121] See OLDENBERG in S. B. E. XXIX, p. 371; RENOU, Écoles, p. 120.

[122] Compare e.g. PGS. 1, 10, 1 with BGS. 1, 1ff.

Roughly speaking, the language of the ritual *sūtras* represents a stage in the history of Sanskrit between the *brāhmaṇas* and the epics. After Baudhāyana and Vādhūla[123] it gradually loses its antique peculiarities (Vedic word forms, tmesis etc.); its syntax is simplified. Though on the whole it becomes normalized, it is not—partly due to its background, partly to its technical character[124]—pure Sanskrit. Grammar cannot be discussed here,[125] but a few points may be mentioned in passing. On one hand the force of tradition led the *sūtrakāras*—and, among them, first and foremost Baudhāyana—to use archaic forms that were no longer recognized by Pāṇini[126]—and it is only natural that features of the basic texts survived in the *sūtras* that belong to the same school.[127] On the other hand a good number of phonetic and grammatical irregularities, solecisms, 'mishandled' compounds, irregular constructions and so on[128] show that the critical remarks made by the Indians themselves on the grammatical ignorance of the liturgists were not entirely mistaken.[129]

Beside the nominal sentence—which is very common in shorter or longer statements[130] and remains prevalent in the *sūtras* of other branches of learning—these authors formulate their rules preferably by means of personal verbs:[131] the plural first person as a pluralis auctoris: "we shall explain . . ." *(vyākhyāsyāmaḥ)*,[132] the indicative stating a factual rule, the so-called normative ('prescriptive') optative, the use of which they introduced, in enjoining a certain action, line of conduct etc.[133] Many rules, being formulated negatively,

---

[123] Cf. also RENOU, in JA 251, p. 179.

[124] On technical terms RENOU, in JA 233, p. 126 (drawing attention to many parallels between the ritual *sūtras* and grammatical literature) and the observations on lexicography and vocabulary in the books and articles mentioned in note 125.

[125] See e.g. the relevant observations made by CALAND, Über . . . Baudhāyana, p. 41; AO 2, p. 152 (Vādhūla); VaikhŚS., p. XVII; in ZDMG 56, p. 552; KASHIKAR, S. Bh. I, p. LX; GAASTRA, J. Ś. S., p. XXV; RAABE, Bijdrage, p. XX; KIRSTE, HGS. ed., p. VII; KNAUER, MGS., p. XLII; GGS. ed. I, p. XV; II, p. 50; ROLLAND, VārGS., p. 49; G. M. PANSE, in VIJ 4, p. 46; BLOOMFIELD, KauśS., p. LVIII; PARPOLA, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 28; 81.

[126] For the relations between the language of the *gṛhyasūtras* and Pāṇini see B. LIEBICH, Pāṇini, Leipzig 1891, p. 36; RENOU, in JA 233 (1941), p. 105; cf. also v. BRADKE, in ZDMG 36, p. 422.

[127] Among the archaic elements are the *saṃpraiṣas*, the solemn orders or directions spoken by the *adhvaryu*; generally speaking, many archaisms originate in the *mantras* used.

[128] For curiosities in Baudhāyana, see CALAND, Über . . . Baudhāyana, p. 51.

[129] For particulars see L. RENOU, in J. WACKERNAGEL, op. cit. Introduction générale, I, p. 16; 71; KASHIKAR, l. cit.; KIRSTE, HGS. ed., p. VII; WINTERNITZ, Mantrapāṭha, p. XV. Kashikar's words in defence of the *sūtrakāras* (S. Ś., p. 38) do not meet this criticism. For the interpretation of commentators: e.g. RENOU, in JA 233, p. 124.

[130] E.g. ĀpŚS. 1, 3, 14 (16) *sa prastaraḥ* "that is the *prastara*"; 1, 5, 6; 9; 3, 18, 1; 6; 4, 1, 2.

[131] Influence of older texts is not foreign to this preference.

[132] E.g. BhŚS. 1, 1, 1; 4, 1, 1; ĀpŚS. 1, 1, 1.

[133] Translations are often not accurate. Compare e.g. BhŚS. 1, 1, 10 "In rites

actually are prohibitions: BhŚS. 5, 16, 12 *nānṛtaṃ vadet* "he should not speak untruth".[134] Outside the quotations past tenses are extremely rare. After Baudhāyana and Vādhūla the number and frequency of the particles—often superfluous in successions of brief and syntactically utterly simple *sūtras*—diminishes.[135] So do the subordinate clauses, also as a result of the increasing use of participial constructions.

The most striking stylistic innovation—and one that was to have a great future—has been the increased use and size of compounds, especially of *dvandva* compounds,[136] a mighty device for compressing one's words; the result was that the use of longer and more complicated expressions came to supersede that of the ancient bipartite ones, which are still frequent in Baudhāyana.[137] One example must suffice; ĀśvŚS. 2, 3, 2:

> *yavāgūr odano dadhi sarpir grāmakāmānnādyakāmendriyakāmatejaskāmānām* "Rice gruel, boiled rice, coagulated milk (and) clarified butter (are respectively the oblations) of those (who are) desirous of a village, desirous of food, desirous of sensory faculties, desirous of brilliant energy".[138]

While many old words fell out of use, the vocabulary was replenished with many new ones, part of them peculiar to an individual school or author[139] and with words and phrases with special meanings.

The supposition is legitimate that at least part of these manuals are composed of sections which in some form or other existed already as separate treatises before they were included in a comprehensive survey of the complete rituals. Although research on this point has as far as I am aware not yet made great progress,[140] in cases such as the *dvaidha-* and *karmāntasūtras* in Bau-

---

pertaining to the gods one wears (ind.) the sacred cord over the left shoulder"; 12 "One should perform (opt.) the rites . . . while facing towards the east . . ."; 14f.; 5, 16, 5f. (ind.): 12ff. (opt.); ŚGS. 1, 3, 3 (ind.); 6, 1, 4, 1 (opt.); GGS. 1, 1, 14; 12, 1. Syntactic and semantic questions cannot be discussed here.

[134] Also BhŚS. 2, 7, 10; 11 (with indicative); 5, 7, 13; 5, 13, 8; 5, 16, 13ff.; 19ff.; 6, 8, 17f.; 10, 8, 1f.; 14, 24, 7; ĀpŚS. 1, 11, 2; 7 (8); 1, 12, 6 (15); VārŚS. 1, 7, 4, 21; 58; GGS. 1, 2, 11ff.; MGS. 1, 1, 3ff.; ĀpGS. 2, 6, 2 etc.; (followed by a motivation) ĀgnGS. 1, 3, 2: 19, 11.

[135] E.g. ĀpŚS. 14, 22, 1f.; ŚŚS. 2, 17, 1; see RENOU, in JA 251, p. 185.

[136] See also RENOU, in BSL, 52, p. 106; JA 251, p. 183.

[137] Cf. CALAND, Über . . . Baudhāyana, p. 44.

[138] Cf. also BŚS. 27, 9: 333, 4ff.; 28, 10: 360, 6ff.; ĀpŚS. 1, 5, 6 (8; enumerative); VārŚS. 1, 5, 1, 5; MŚS. 11, 7, 1, 9, etc. and the type *yonigotraśrutavṛttasaṃpannāḥ* (BŚS. 2, 3: 36, 6). Enumerations built up by uncompounded words do of course occur, e.g. ĀgnGS. 1, 2, 3: 17, 14. A case of continued repetition of the second member of a compound occurs at MGS. 1, 7, 9 *sītāloṣṭaṃ vediloṣṭaṃ* etc. "a clod of earth from a furrow, . . . from a sacrificial bed . . . etc."

[139] See e.g. KASHIKAR, Śrautakośa, Engl. section I, p. 10; S. Ś., p. 100; and S. Bh. I, p. LXV and other introductions to editions. On ritual terminology also KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 983 etc. For a case of euphemism (ĀśvGS. 3, 10, 2) still an orthodox practice: V. M. APTE, in NIA 3, p. 236.

[140] Cf. F. KNAUER, Das Mānava-Gṛhya-Sūtra, Petersburg 1897, p. XLIV.

dhāyana's *śrauta* manual and many heterogenous portions of his *gṛhya* works,[141] certain portions of the Mānava-Śrautasūtra, the Kauśikasūtra and additional chapters in other works[142] the probabilities seem to be in favour of this assumption, which—together with the probability, in some cases, of recast and revision—can also furnish an explanation of certain differences in the order of the rituals or of the chapters in different manuscripts of the same work, omissions and so on.[143] It seems further beyond doubt that for some time the position of certain chapters or sections was, in the tradition of a school, not fixed or that in course of time they were transposed. It is even difficult to determine the right dividing line between *śrauta* and *gṛhya* subject-matter. Thus the *samāvartana* (the pupil's returning home after finishing his study of the Veda), which is a domestic ritual, is included as 17, 39—44 in Baudhāyana's *śrauta* work.[144]

As to the structure of the *kalpasūtras* as complete works,[145] their divisions and internal organization, these are far from uniform. The Baudhāyana corpus comprising Śrautasūtra, Śulbasūtra, Gṛhyasūtra with Pariśiṣṭas, Pitṛmedhasūtra, Pravarasūtra and Dharmasūtra is very well arranged; it consists of *praśnas* (lit. "interrogations"[146]) subdivided into *adhyāyas*, in part of the *dharma* manual also into *khaṇḍas*. In accordance with the character of a *pravacana* the *adhyāyas* of the *śrauta* work betray no traces of a division into *sūtras* or other smaller units; each section is practically a whole in itself. Nevertheless, the editor was confronted with serious difficulties because the various traditions of the text differ considerably in the numbering of chapters and sections; the commentator Bhavasvāmin (8th century) who does not mention a division into *khaṇḍas*, was acquainted with not less than three numbering systems, one of them continuous.[147] On the other hand, the Kātyāyana-Śrautasūtra is divided into *adhyāyas*, (smaller) sections *(kaṇḍikās)* and *sūtras* as separated and detached subdivisions of the *kaṇḍikās*. This threefold division is normal, but the relation between the *sūtras*—not infrequently of uncertain extent[148] and numbered by the editor—and the sections of which they form part can be different. In Āśvalāyana's Śrautasūtra the former—distinguished

[141] See also HARTING, Selections (quoted in ch. III, 4, n. 10), p. XIX.

[142] Cf. v. GELDER, MŚS. ed., p. 3.

[143] See n. 48ff.; the *pavitreṣṭi* is absent in ĀśvŚS. 2, 12 but found in the *prayoga*; one might have expected to find ĀśvŚS. 2, 8, 4—14 *(punarādheya)* after 2, 1, 36 *(agnyādheya)*; compare also C. G. KASHIKAR, in JGJRI 15, p. 158 on BhŚS. 2, 8—11.

[144] Other instances have been mentioned in chapter II, 5.

[145] See RENOU, in IIJ 1, p. 12.

[146] The student had to ask the teacher for instruction.

[147] For particulars see CALAND, BŚS. ed. I, p. XI. The chapters of the Śrautasūtras probably were for a long time unnumbered (CALAND, Über . . . Baudhāyana, p. 8). For different divisions etc. in manuscripts of the same text see also CALAND, P. M. S., p. VIII; GAASTRA, JŚS. ed., p. X; KASHIKAR, S. Bh. I, p. XXXVIII; PARPOLA, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 40.

[148] For some details: RENOU, in JA 251, p. 200, n. 6.

by the commentary—are less independent, the sections *(kaṇḍikā)* constituting almost continuous wholes. In fact the division into *sūtras* is in many manuscripts no more based on an ancient tradition than interpunction.[149] Whereas Lāṭyāyana's book is divided into ten *prapāṭhakas* ("lectures"), most of them comprising twelve *kaṇḍikās*, Drāhyāyaṇa's manual consists of thirty-one *paṭalas* ("collections, sections") and each of these, as a rule, of four *khaṇḍas*; but both divisions are actually found in both texts.[150] In the larger part of the Mānava-Śrautasūtra there is a fourfold division. The 141 *kaṇḍikās* constituting the 14 *adhyāyas* of the Kauśika-Sūtra are numbered continuously. In Devapāla's commentary and the edition the Laugākṣi-Gṛhyasūtra consists of seventy-three *kāṇḍikās* but another commentator, Brāhmaṇabala, mentions a division into *adhyāyas*. One manuscript of the Āpastamba-Gṛhyasūtra marks both the ends of *khaṇḍas* and *paṭalas*, the former by numbers, the latter by a colophon, but other manuscripts mark only the ends of the *khaṇḍas*. This survey may suffice.

[149] Cf. RENOU, in JA 231, p. 157; TH. BLOCH ‚Gṛhya- und Dharmasūtra der Vaikhānasa, Leipzig 1896, p. 1. The divisions can sometimes be corrected.

[150] See PARPOLA, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 39.

Chapter VII

TRANSMISSION OF THE TEXTS, COMMENTARIES AND SECONDARY LITERATURE

In the course of the 19th and 20th centuries many manuscripts, kept in Indian libraries or private houses, came to light.[1] Part of them have been used in ritual practice and are the last of a series of transcripts: it has for many centuries been the duty of the brahmins to study the traditional lore and to preserve and transmit it unaltered. Some transcripts are not only dated but give in their colophons also information on the date and origin of the manuscripts of which they are copies,[2] occasionally even an author and title of the text itself.[3] In the transcripts corruptions caused by the long tradition were frequently and more or less expertly corrected and incomprehensible places—often injudiciously—emended.[4] Part of the corruptions were due to differences in orthography[5] or orthographical details between the transcripts and the older manuscripts (often 15–17th cent.). Not infrequently various additions and modifications crept into the original manuals, partly caused by developments of the ritual, partly under the influence of other schools.[6] The question as to whether the ritual *sūtras* have been written down from the beginning is undecided.[7] The strong memory of the Indian experts, their predilection for the

---

[1] For a survey of cataloguing in the years 1800—1941: P. K. Gode, in S. M. Katre, Introduction to Indian textual criticism, Bombay 1941; and see K. G. Ghurye, Preservation of learned tradition in India, Bombay 1950 (not without inaccuracies; in ch. III a list of Indian libraries).

[2] For information on *sūtra* manuscripts and their discovery see e.g. Knauer, MŚS. ed., p. XV; MGS. ed. I, p. I; Caland, Brāhmaṇa- en sūtra-aanwinsten, Amsterdam Acad. 1920; BŚS. ed. I, p. VII; JGS. ed., p. V; VaikhŚS. ed., p. IX; for VādhŚS. see above, ch. II, 5; Ravi Varma, ĀgnivGS. ed., p. VI; Kashikar, S. Bh. I, p. XXXIII; and other introductions to editions; C. G. Kashikar, in Vol. Kaviraj, p. 14 (on a Vārāha manuscript; see also ALB 25, p. 229).

[3] The attribution of the Śāṅkhāyana-Śrautasūtra to Śāṅkhāyana rests only on the unanimous testimony of the colophons.

[4] Cf. also Dilip Kanjilal, Text editing and textual criticism in Sanskrit literature, OH 17, p. 41.

[5] For *grantha* manuscripts see e.g. Gaastra, JŚS. ed., p. XI; in general e.g. Knauer, MŚS. ed. I, p. XXIX.

[6] See e.g. Hillebrandt, ŚŚS. ed. I, p. X. For references of the commentator Ānartīya to another *śākhā* see e.g. ŚŚS. 2, 7, 2; 4.

[7] See also Renou, in JA 251, p. 199; 215, n. 175; Écoles, p. 222 (with some references); Knauer, GGS. ed. II, p. 31 and others; Kashikar, Śrautakośa, English section I, p. 7.

oral tradition, the character of the rules and formulations, the existence of many oral aphorisms, and, last but not least, the occurrence of mnemonic devices in the texts themselves[8] might make us believe that a written copy, if it did exist from the beginning, was during a certain period no more than an aide-mémoire.

From the above it will be clear that the quality as well as the quantity of the often incomplete manuscripts on which the editions are based is in many cases insufficient; part of the editions could be emended.[9]

Most ritual *sūtras* are accompanied by commentaries.[10] Turning now to this unduly neglected subject we should be aware that their nature and structure can only be understood by a correct insight into the origin of this class of literature[11] in the direct personal instruction of teachers who lived in close community with their pupils. Much of the contents of these works is based on discourses delivered to students and devotees. Also it has as a rule been believers, followers of the ritual schools, defenders of their traditions who composed the commentaries. Occasionally commentators supply more or less reliable information on the "successions of (their) teachers" *(guruparaṃparā)* or chains of the depositories—sometimes successive generations of a family[12]—that are to guarantee the authenticity of the traditional learning. Or they refer to other works of their making.[13] The purpose pursued by these authors is, to quote one of them, Agnisvāmin, in his introduction to Lāṭyāyana,[14] the explanation and clarification of the *sūtras* which are composed

---

[8] At the end of a *praśna* of BGS. the initial words of the *adhyāyas* are repeated.

[9] For manuscripts with very few real variants see e.g. GARBE, ĀpŚS. ed. I, p. 9; for others with many variants v. GELDER, MŚS. ed., p. 1; see also PARPOLA, Ś.L.D. I, 1, p. 79. Editors have to face peculiar difficulties: emendations effected by substitution of the readings of a parallel text are doubtful because the several schools differed in numerous details and *gṛhya* texts often adapted the wording of the common traditions (cf. also V. M. APTE, in NIA 3, p. 240); reliable ritual experts belonging to the same tradition as the text and able to correct corruptions or discrepancies are becoming very rare (on families: C. G. KASHIKAR, in JASBo. 36—37, p. 40). For the imperfections of older editions see e.g. PARPOLA, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 20. Indian editions often have the same value as a modern manuscript.

[10] There exist manuscripts of *sūtras* with and without a commentary. In the former case the commentary—e.g. Devapāla's on the Kāṭhaka Gṛhyasūtra—tends to supersede the text. For observations on textual interpretation, commentaries, parallel passages etc. see e.g. KNAUER, GGS. ed. II, p. 16; CALAND, Altind. Zauberritual, p. IV and in ZDMG 51, p. 128ff.; 136; DRESDEN, M. G. S., p. VIII; GONDA, Savayajñas, p. 9; V. L., p. 39 etc.

[11] For more particulars see the introductions to the editions and, for the *śrautasūtras*, also KASHIKAR, Ś. Ś.

[12] For instance, from Devapāla's commentary on the Laugākṣi-Gṛhyasūtra we learn that he was a native of Jullundhar, that his father Haripāla was proficient in the Veda and that his grandfather was called Bhaṭṭa Upendra; see KAUL SHĀSTRĪ, ed. I, p. 5.

[13] Thus Somāditya, who wrote a commentary on the Vaitāna-Śrautasūtra, refers to his work on the Kauśika-Sūtra (5, 2). On his person and family no further information is available.

[14] Edited and translated by A. PARPOLA, in ALB 31—32, p. 554.

"for the sake of (clearing up) indistinct (prescriptions), rejecting unwanted (injunctions), (laying down) rules left to be supplied, alternatives to single rules, accumulations, and restrictions".

Often incomplete or covering only part of a *sūtra* work[15] these commentaries differ in character, extent and value. Bhavasvāmin's *bhāṣya* (8th century)—i.e. a commentary which interprets a *sūtra*, often word for word, with explanations of its own[16]—called Vivaraṇa ('Exposition, Interpretation'), and available for BŚS. I–XXVI is very short, explaining only such words and rites as in the author's opinion are obscure.[17] On the other hand, Karka's or Karkopadhyāya's[18] *bhāṣya* on Kātyāyana explains the entire *sūtra* work and is full of Mīmāṃsā discussions. Gārgya Gopālayajvan's excellent *bhāṣya* on the Āpastamba-Pitṛmedhasūtra[19] is more than a simple commentary; completing the materials contained in the *sūtra* text it furnishes the reader with valuable quotations from allied literature. One of the best works of this class, exact, critical, a "fairly safe guide" and full of quotations, notably from the rare Jaiminīya texts, is Dhanvin's exegesis of Drāhyāyaṇa called Chandogasūtrasya dīpa "Lamp of the Chanters' Sūtra" (9th century ?).[20] As appears from a stanza in his introduction Gārgya Nārāyaṇa based his *vṛtti*—a brief explanation by means of glosses and paraphrases—on Devasvāmin's *bhāṣya* on the Śrautasūtra of Āśvalāyana which has not yet been published.[21] The reliable oldest commentary on Āpastamba's Śrauta work, written by Dhūrtasvāmin,[22] was in its turn made the basis of a *vṛtti* by Kauśika Rāmāgnicit. Another author, Rudradatta—whose work extends only to *praśna* XV—is one of those experts who cite many passages from other *śrautasūtras* in support of or in contrast to Āpastamba's manual.[23] Kapardisvāmin is known as the author of *bhāṣyas* to all Āpastamba

[15] There is for instance a commentary attributed to Sāyaṇa on BŚS. I *(darśapūrṇamāsau)*.

[16] The traditional definition is: *sūtrārtho varṇyate yatra vākyaiḥ sūtrānusāribhiḥ / svapadāni ca varṇyante bhāṣyaṃ bhāṣyavido viduḥ*.

[17] For Bhavasvāmin and other commentaries on BŚS. see CALAND, Über ... Baudhāyana, p. 15; BŚS. ed. I, p. X; KASHIKAR, S. Ś., p. 49, and in Vol. P. K. Gode, Poona 1960, p. 203.

[18] Or also Upādhyāya-Karka. Commentators often bear more than one name. So do their works: in this case Kātyāyana-sūtra-Bhāṣya or Kātyāyanasūtra-Vivaraṇa. See also R. SIMON, Über einige Commentatoren zu Sūtren des weissen Yajurveda, in SB München 1895, p. 617. Authorship is sometimes uncertain or disputed. Thus, according to M. LAKSHMINARASIṂHIAH, in IHQ 17, p. 518 Cakrapāṇi, not Haradatta has been the author of ĀśvGMantra-Vyākhyā I. See also C. KUNHAN RAJA, in ALB 2 (1938), p. 17; 71 on a palm leaf manuscript in which the *mantras* of the ĀśvGS. are commented upon.

[19] See CALAND, P. M. S., p. XIX.

[20] See CALAND, in GGA 1907, p. 245; RAGHU VIRA, in JVS 1, p. 111; PARPOLA, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 103; 110.

[21] See also K. MYLIUS, in MIO 17, p. 99.

[22] Commentators whose names end in *svāmin* belong to the comparatively older period (not later than the 13th century). For Dhūrtasvāmin see also KASHIKAR, in IIJ 13, p. 95.

[23] On Rudradatta: CALAND, in ZDMG 56, p. 552.

texts.[24] Contrary to the usual practice Śrīnivāsa explains also the *mantras* of the Jaiminīya-Gṛhyasūtra. In Harihara's *bhāṣya* on the Pāraskara-Gṛhyasūtra[25] (between 1266 and 1300 A.D.), which in his readings differs considerably from those contained in Stenzler's edition, only part of the *mantras* is explained; others, no longer understood, are indicated by initial and final words. Reṇuka's metrical explanation of the same *sūtra* work (1266) contains some interesting additions, inter alia, *karṇavedha*, i.e. the rite of piercing the lobes of a child's ear, and astrological indications. Rāmacandra (±1430—1460),[26] a brahmin of the Bhāradvāja *gotra*, wrote several commentaries, including one on the Śāṅkhāyana-Gṛhyasūtra. None of the commentaries on Hiraṇyakeśin's Śrautasūtra is complete, and all of them are modern.[27] Śrīnivāsadīkṣita's *vyākhyā* ("explanation, comment") on the Vaikhānasa-Śrautasūtra[28] really is a *prayoga-vṛtti*, that is a brief explanation of a practical manual for the use of officiating priests, and accordingly rather a paraphrase than an explanation of the words of the *sūtra* text. Although the commentaries of Miśra Bālakṛṣṇa on the *prāksoma* portion and of Agnisvāmin on the *agniṣṭoma* as treated in the Mānava Śrautasūtra could shed light on difficult places the commentaries on this manual are generally speaking badly informed on the intricacies of the ritual. Sudarśanārya (between 1300 and 1500 A.D.) has in his Tātparyadarśana copied almost the whole of the other, and better, commentary on Āpastamba's Gṛhyasūtra, viz. Haradatta's Anākula.[29]

In addition to lexical[30] and ritual exegesis, supplements and elucidations etc. these commentaries give also information on grammatical forms; sometimes they also digress on points of ritual interest drawing on personal experience or engaging in polemics.[31] In controversial passages names of earlier authorities of the same school are left unmentioned. A thorough comparative study of the procedures of these experts would bring to light some interesting differences with modern philological methods. For instance, quotations are very often paraphrastic rather than literal;[32] second-hand sources are sometimes utilized with-

[24] See D. Srinivasachari, Āpastamba Śulbasūtra, Mysore 1931, p. I; IV.

[25] See Simon, op. cit., p. 639.

[26] See H. G. Naraharī, in ALB 5, p. 37; 86.

[27] For details see Kashikar, S. Ś., p. 61.

[28] See Caland, VaikhŚS. ed., p. XIV.

[29] M. Winternitz, The Āpastambīya Gṛhyasūtra, Vienna 1887, p. X. On his date: P. K. Gode, in ABORI 37, p. 55. For Haradatta see also K. Madhava Krishna Sarma, in ALB 3, p. 151 (in connexion with his commentary on the Ekāgnikāṇḍa or Mantrapraśna). I also refer to the observations made on KāṭhGS. or LGS. in chapter III, 4.

[30] See e.g. Salomons, BhGS. ed., p. XVII.

[31] E.g. Devapāla on LGS. I, p. 51; Dhūrtasvāmin on ĀpŚS. 1, 1, 4. *Captationes benevolentiae* are not unknown.

[32] Many authors of the secondary literature had no direct access to the original texts. Being moreover more interested in the ideas than in the exact wordings, titles—references to Āśvalāyana-Sūtra etc. are not rare—and authorship they often quoted from memory. See also K. Parameśwara Aithal, Āśvalāyanagṛhya-

out the slightest warning; references are made to variant readings that are found nowhere. Authoritative commentators have no doubt often established the wording of the text according to their own lights.[33] In adjusting the discrepancies in the text those who explained Baudhāyana used their own discretion.[34] Some commentators—for instance, Agnisvāmin on Lāṭyāyana—fell into the methodical error of applying to ritual *sūtras* interpretatory principles valid for the extremely condensed grammatical works, especially the rule that there are no single useless or redundant words or syllables in these texts.[35] Contradictions do occur, but anachronisms—for which there is not much room—are few in number and easily recognizable.[36] Difficult passages, especially in stanzas quoted, are sometimes passed over in silence. Confusion of ideas is not always concealed, stylistic imperfection not always avoided.

The relationship between commentaries and scriptures is a general problem that has not yet attracted the attention which it deserves. How far was the authority of the commentaries generally recognized?; how far diversification of opinions accepted?; how far were the procedures of interpretation standardized?; could ideas peculiar to an individual commentator be easily legitimated? How far were these authors acquainted with the ritual literature as a whole and with the interrelations of the writings belonging to the several schools? How far had they access to forms of the texts unknown to us?[37] What were the reasons why some commentators follow only part of their texts closely while disagreeing with them in other portions?[38] Was it only the exigencies of ritual practice that so often determined them to treat only a single ritual or complex of rites?[39] It will therefore be clear that it is as yet difficult to pronounce a fair judgment upon this class of literature as a whole and many of its productions in particular. It is hardly possible to know how far an individual commentator drew on old and authentic tradition and how far he was influenced by secondary interpretations.[40] Generally speaking, the later the

---

pariśiṣṭa, Adyar-Madras 1964, p. 14. For citations and their significance as a means of verifying readings etc. see KASHIKAR, S. Ś., p. 51; on attempts to reconstruct lost texts by means of citations: S. CH. BANERJI, Reconstruction of dharmasūtras, JOIB 8, p. 14. Reconstructions based on commentaries are often precarious; in some texts of this class even *sūtras* have now and then been replaced by explanations (see e.g. CALAND, P. M. S., p. XXII).

[33] Cf. also PARPOLA, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 110.

[34] KASHIKAR, in ABORI 29, p. 115.

[35] For details see PARPOLA, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 111.

[36] It is interesting to notice that Haradatta, though very orthodox, may have had leanings to Śivaism (LAKSHMINARASIMHIAH, op. cit., p. 519); Dhanvin was a Viṣṇuite (PARPOLA, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 103).

[37] See e.g. CALAND, in AO 2, p. 143; 145.

[38] See e.g. CALAND, JGS. ed., p. VII.

[39] There could also be a 'psychology' of commentators: the initial parts of their productions are often more detailed and circumstantial than the rest.

[40] In translating *sūtra* texts it is advisable to mark not only insertions and explanations of the translator but also all additions and elucidations borrowed from commentators. *Sūtra* texts should be translated as literally as possible; the use of

commentator, the greater the chance that he holds erroneous opinions, but the very dependence of many later authors on great predecessors can make them custodians of genuine traditions.[41] Although the ancient interpreters were not regarded as *munis* but as human teachers, they often were so highly respected that their opinions were considered equivalent to those of the inspired sages *(munimata)* and their works could be substituted for the *śruti* if the latter was felt to be incomplete. In those cases the commentator's opinions were held to have been founded on *śruti*. This belief in the authenticity of ancient authorities was based on the theory of the progressive discovery of revealed truth. If the basic texts fail to give the information needed later authors may try to uncover a corner of revelation that might previously have been perceived too dimly.[42] So authoritative commentators were held to be links between the age of the seers and later periods, relating the distant past to the present.[43] A thorough and systematic study of this literature could therefore deepen our knowledge of the modifications and reinterpretations to which the old doctrines and practices were subjected, and to other problems connected with their survival. However, the opinions of modern scholars with regard to the value of these works and the use to be derived from them have differed greatly.[44] Whereas some of them have put themselves to a large extent under their guidance, others have been very reluctant to adopt their paraphrases and explanations. The best way seems to be to read them critically, to reject what we know to be impossible, to adopt that which is consistent with knowledge gathered from other sources and to note for reconsideration the information which might be correct or valuable but cannot for the moment be checked.

One would probably not be very wrong if one supposed that the need for brief practical manuals stating in plain terms the details and technicalities of the sacrificial rites was felt already at an early period. Such an easier and practical literature, indispensable for officiants, does indeed exist. For the greater part of later date and decidedly post-Vedic it is mainly represented by 'guide-books' *(paddhati)* and 'practical courses of the procedures' *(prayoga)*.[45]

(translated) technical terms should be consistent. The *mantras* should be translated in full because many *sūtras* remain obscure without a thorough knowledge of the tenor and purport of the formulas. Observations on translating *sūtras* were made by KNAUER, GGS. ed. I, Vorwort etc.; CALAND, Ś. Ā. I, p. 4; LOKESH CHANDRA, in CALAND, Ś. Ś. S., p. V; KASHIKAR, in Śrautakośa, Engl. section I, p. 11; S. Ś., p. 136; and S. Bh. II, Preface; GONDA, Savayajñas, p. 7.

[41] See also SIMON, in SB München 1895, p. 606; 623, drawing attention to cases in which Jayarāma (after 1655) and Rāmakṛṣṇa (18th century) literally reproduce important observations made by Karka.

[42] Moreover, a distinction was made (Gārgya Nārāyaṇa on ĀśvŚS. 1, 1, 1) between traditionally well-studied texts *(samāmnāya)* and those which were not so well studied *(samyagabhyāsarahita)*; see also K. PARAMEŚWARA AITHAL, in ALB 33, p. 191.

[43] This implies that there is less personal pride of authorship.

[44] See e.g. OLDENBERG, in S. B. E. XXIX, p. 263.

[45] For some details: HILLEBRANDT, Rit., p. 38.

Though continuing far into modern times, it has mostly remained unpublished and consequently is—in spite of its intrinsic value and helpfulness in understanding the *sūtras*—little known in the West.

Paddhatis are designed to be clear expositions of the ritual of a school or religious community or also of particular rites such as marriage or disposal of the dead. Generally speaking, they follow the *sūtras* closely. Thus there is a Baudhāyanīya-Paddhati composed by Keśasvāmin;[46] an Agniṣṭoma-Paddhati;[47] a Paddhati on Kātyāyana by Yājñikadeva;[48] a Chandoga-Paddhati by Bhavadeva which was utilized by Colebrooke;[49] an Antyeṣṭi-Paddhati, dealing with the funeral rites, by Harihara, the son of Bhāskara Bhaṭṭa.[50] Another *paddhati* devoted to the same ceremonies is the Atharvavedasya antyeṣṭikarma, one of the accessary writings used for the edition of the Kauśika-Sūtra.[51] To the other literature of this class affiliated with that Sūtra belongs also the writing entitled Daśa karmāṇi brahmavedoktāni, the "Ten rites mentioned in the Atharvaveda"; it restricts itself to those parts of the Kauśika, which deal with domestic ritual only (*saṃskāras* etc.) and cites the *mantras* in full.[52] A more extensive work of the same genre, but likewise restricted to the domestic rites and quoting the usual atharvanic literature, is the Atharvaṇīya-Paddhati; in accordance with a statement made in the beginning it is to some extent an 'explanation' *(vivaraṇa)* adhering to the text of the Paddhati of Keśava. This work, the Keśavī, "aims at the expansion of the ritual presented by Kauśika, rather than towards an explanation of the words";[53] cases are not wanting however in which such lexical interpretations are—often satisfactorily—given. Keśava seems to have been acquainted with the writings of a wide range of atharvanic authorities; some of these are often quoted.[54] Nārāyaṇa, the son of Paśupatiśarman, wrote a *paddhati* on the Śāṅkhāyana-Śrautasūtra (16th century). Another 'guide-book' on the same subject was already at an earlier date produced by Rāmacandra, the prolific commentator mention of whom has already been made.[55] Among the nine books of this author—some of them treatises on astrology and prognostics; also a Karmadīpikā—is the Navakuṇḍa-

---

[46] CALAND, P. M. S., p. VIII.

[47] Edited by B. P. SHARMA, Benares 1937.

[48] For this text (1—5) see WEBER's edition of the Kātyāyana-Śrautasūtra.

[49] H. T. COLEBROOKE, On the religious ceremonies of the Hindus, Asiatic Researches 5 and 7, Calcutta 1798; 1801, had not yet access to the *sūtras*; he drew also upon the Brāhmaṇasarvasva (see below) and other secondary works.

[50] KASHIKAR, in JORM 28, p. 6.

[51] BLOOMFIELD, K. S., p. XVI. For the following titles: ibidem, p. XIV etc.

[52] Another *paddhati*, likewise called Daśakarmāṇi, has no connexion with the Atharvaveda.

[53] BLOOMFIELD, op. cit., p. XVII.

[54] Some other *paddhatis:* for domestic rites Śyāmacaraṇa Kaviratna, Trivedīyakriyākāṇḍapaddhati, Calcutta 1906; Śāṅkhāyana-Brahmakarmapaddhati, Bombay 1884.

[55] See H. G. NARAHARI, in ALB 5, p. 86.

Vidhi[56]—also known as Kuṇḍamaṇḍapalakṣaṇam or Kuṇḍanirmāṇaślokāḥ—which is a short treatise on the shape and dimensions of the sacred fireplaces, sacrificial sheds and allied subjects in post-Vedic ritual. This work, written in 1449 A.D., gives also much information about the author himself who lived in the Naimiṣa forest. Since there are many manuscripts it must have enjoyed much popularity. A prose work by an unknown author, of doubtful genuineness and betraying its comparatively late origin (15th century) by its language, style and structure may be described as a *paddhati* or as a *prayoga*[57] but, contrary to its title Āśvalāyana-Gṛhya-Pariśiṣṭa,[58] not as a collection of paralipomena to a domestic manual. It deals—minutely but in a convenient way—with almost all the subjects of the domestic ritual and many more and was no doubt intended to facilitate the task of priests officiating at the domestic ceremonies.

Whether or not practical manuals *(prayoga)*[59] were in vogue already before the compilation of the *śrautasūtras* proper,[60] it is a fact that they are normally related to definite Vedic schools. Anyhow, the *prayogas* extant are generally based on the *śrautasūtras*, from which they generally speaking do not deviate considerably. Nevertheless, there exist differences between both classes of literature. Partly under the influence of other Vedic traditions and partly on account of changed circumstances they have often introduced certain modifications into the traditional rituals of their schools. There even existed different *prayoga* traditions in one and the same school. Some of these works are of considerable length entering into many details; in part of the modern ones the rituals are abridged. The dates of their composition can hardly be ascertained.

Both classes of ritual have their *prayogas*. As to those for the solemn rites, there are practical manuals for every ceremony,[61] part of them dealing with the

---

[56] See NARAHARI, in ALB 2, p. 37.

[57] There was no hard and fast line between the two classes. For instance, beside the Loṣṭacitiprayoga of the Āpastambins there exists a *paddhati* of the followers of Hiraṇyakeśin on the same subject (sepulchral mounds).

[58] Published: Calcutta (B. I.) 1869; Bombay 1894; Poona 1936. For more particulars: K. PARAMEŚWARA AITHAL, Āśvalāyanagṛhyapariśiṣṭa, Adyar-Madras 1964.

[59] See also KASHIKAR, in IA 3, 1 (1964), p. 83; Śrautakośa, Engl. section I, p. 7.

[60] A. HILLEBRANDT, Das altindische Neu- und Vollmondsopfer, Jena 1880, p. XV, and Ritualliteratur, p. 38 was—in contradistinction to G. THIBAUT, Arthasaṃgraha, Benares 1882, p. III and J. EGGELING, ŚB., p. XLVII and somewhat speculatively—of the opinion that some sort of written *prayoga* existed as early as the time of the composition of the *brāhmaṇas* and before the *śrautasūtras* as a separate class of writing.

[61] For instance, a *prayoga* of the *darśapūrṇamāsau* according to the Āpastamba school, published in the Darśapūrṇamāsaprakāśa, Poona 1924. The Agnihotracandrikā, Poona 1934 comprises the *prayogas* of the *agnihotra*, the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*, the *āgrayaṇa* as well as the relevant expiations according to Āśvalāyana and Āpastamba; Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa (second half of the 16th century) composed a Vivāhaprayoga (marriage), published (with a translation) at Bangalore 1891. The Āpastambasūtradhvanitārthakārikā (ed. by Ch. T. BHATTACHARYA, Calcutta 1903)

function of an individual priest, others with groups of priests.[62] Those which treat a complete sacrificial ritual seem to be rare.[63] There is no use in enumerating many titles,[64] but a few exceptions may be made. For the *agniṣṭoma* there exists a detailed manual dealing with the *ādhvaryavam*, the *brahmatvam* and the duties of the *yajamāna* and his wife written by Rudradeva and based on the Baudhāyana tradition.[65] The extensive Āpastamba-Smārtaprayoga[66] introduces itself as a compilation from older texts for the benefit of the followers of the Yajurveda and deals in sixty chapters with the domestic ritual. There are, inter alia, sections on the *aṅkurārpaṇa* (an auspicious rite with sprouts, with inserted verses), the *palāśahoma* (a rite for a boy near a *palāśa* tree to be performed after the *upanayana*), the *arkavivāha* (when a man loses by death two wives one after another he has to perform a marriage ceremony with the *arka* (a small tree) before marrying a third wife), the *īśānabali*,[67] the *piṇḍodvāsana* (if one wishes to have a son one should in the *śrāddha* ceremony offer the ball of rice destined for the grandfather to one's wife) and other rites that are neither Vedic nor touched upon in the Gṛhyasūtra. The style is concise and often abrupt. Mention may also be made of Veṅkaṭeśa's Prayogamālā[68] which deals with the 'sacraments' *(saṃskāra)*, the other domestic rites and the funeral ceremonies. Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa (16th century, born 1513), the most famous of the gifted family of the Bhaṭṭas (Benares) who exercised a profound influence over later writers, produced inter alia the Prayogaratna[69] which up to the present day is a very popular manual of the *saṃskāras* and other domestic ceremonies.[70]

---

compiled by Trikāṇḍamaṇḍana is an important source for our knowledge of the performance of Soma and other rituals (see KASHIKAR, in CASS, Studies 2, p. 13).

[62] For a survey of manuscripts see R. G. BHANDARKAR, Report on the search for Sanskrit manuscripts 1882—1883, Bombay 1884, nº 522—541.

[63] For a *prayoga* on the *darśapūrṇamāsau* see Hillebrandt, Neu- und Vollmondsopfer, p. XVI.

[64] For Baudhāyana see CALAND, P. M. S., p. VIII and Über . . . Baudhāyana, p. 15; for Āpastamba CALAND, Ś.Ā. III, p. 4; for Vādhūla CALAND, in AO 1, p. 4; for Bhāradvāja Bhāradvājasūtra-Śrāddhaprayogaḥ, ed. by SUBRAHMANYA DIKSIT, Madras 1970; for Āśvalāyana ŚS.: Mañcana's Āśvalāyanaprayogadīpikā, Benares 1907 and S. SUNDARESA SASTRI, in Āśvalāyanāparaprayoga in Journal Tanjore Sarasvati Mahal Library 18 and 19 (incomplete; dealing with a considerable variety of subjects, among them ritual gifts, averting disaster; influence of Viṣṇuism); for Kātyāyana: the Kātīyeṣṭidīpaka, Benares 1924 and Kātīya-Tarpaṇaprayoga, Etawah 1902; for the Jaiminīyas: Jaiminīya-Prayogavivaraṇa, ed. by A. RAṄGASVĀMĪ AIYAṄGĀR, Kumbakonam 1923. For Lāṭyāyana and Drāhyāyaṇa: PARPOLA, Ś. L. D. I, 2, p. 99. Other titles are mentioned in the bibliographies by RENOU and DANDEKAR.

[65] J. EGGELING, Catalogue of the Sanskrit manuscripts in the Library of the India Office, I, London 1887, nº 398.

[66] Published (serially) by S. SUNDAREŚA ŚĀSTRĪ and V. SUNDARA SARMA in Journal Tanjore Sarasvati Mahal Library 14—17, Thanjavur 1960ff.

[67] See KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 306; 546; 831.

[68] Published in Bombay 1886.

[69] Published at Poona 1915.

[70] For further information see KANE, H. Dh. I, ²Poona 1975, p. 903.

Tālavṛntanivāsin, also called Āṇḍapilla or Aṇḍa Pillai, a resident of the Tanjore distict (before the 16th century), is the author of some interesting *prayogavṛttis* (*prayogas* which can be considered a kind of commentary), inter alia a Chandogasya pradīpasya vṛtti based on or affiliated with the Pañca- and Ṣaḍviṃśa-Brāhmaṇas, Drāhyāyaṇa and other texts "that are not inconsistent with the tradition" and a similar work on the Āpastamba-Śrautasūtra which he not only explained but adapted, modified, enlarged so as to meet the requirements of his age.[71]

In addition to the *prayogas* proper the ritualists produced almost innumerable other treatises, part of which *prayoga*like or allied to that genre. There are works consisting of memorial verses *(kārikā)*, a sort of versified *sūtras*, summarizing the learned or technical teachings in a condensed form. The Āśvalāyana-Gṛhyakārikā[72] was, according to an anonymous commentator, composed on the basis of Nārāyaṇa's Vṛtti and in its turn supplied with an explanation:

> "taking that Vṛtti as a basis and considering the views of Jayanta and others which are in conformity with the Sūtra, the author ... set forth the procedure in order. Still, some people neglecting this Kārikā, though it is of use to carry one through the rites, perform, on account of the difficulty arising from its brevity, the rites in accordance with the *paddhati*, regarding this alone to be useful in this respect. Therefore, on account of the impossibility of removing doubts by a mere *paddhati* as to what is first and what is last ... some one, through the favour of the deity presiding over the ceremonial, having sat at the feet of a master the like of whom does not exist ..., belonging to the Āśvalāyana school of the Ṛgveda ... is now expounding the whole Kārikā for removing doubts concerning the rites that are prescribed ..."

A disciple of Śrīnivāsārya based a similar work of 215 *kārikās* dealing with the *agniṣṭoma* on Bhavatrāta's commentary on the Jaiminīya-Śrautasūtra;[73] he characterized it (st. 5) as a *prayogadīpikā* "A lamp (illumining) ritual practice".

A curious type of ritual text, called *ṛcaka* (or *karmakāṇḍapaddhati*, "*paddhatis* dealing with sections of the ritual"), contains collections of *mantras* to be used in propitiating the planets *(grahaśānti)* as well as prescriptions for the performance of the main 'sacraments' *(saṃskāra)*, *upanayana*, marriage etc.

Other works comprise domestic ritual and topics properly belonging to that class of *smṛti* literature which deals with *dharma*. An outstanding book of this category is Halāyudha's Brāhmaṇasarvasva "The Essence of the Brāhmaṇas".[74] The author was a highly-placed functionary, possibly a judge, under the Bengal king Lakṣmaṇasena who patronized him (12th century). His father, an opulent

---

[71] See Parpola, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 107; B. V. Kamesvara Aiyar in QJMS 13, p. 529.

[72] Edited in Gārgya-Nārāyaṇīyavṛttisaṃvalitam āśvalāyanīyaṃ gṛhyasūtram... gṛhyakārikāś ca, by V. L. Paṇśīkar, Bombay 1909; a new edition by B. Sukthankar 1909; see R. G. Bhandarkar, in Trans. 9 Int. Congr. Orient., p. 413.

[73] Published by D. Gaastra, edition of the JŚS., p. 36.

[74] Edition: D. Bhattacarya, Calcutta 1960 (with an extensive introduction, index of *mantras* etc.). Compare also J. Jolly, Recht und Sitte, Strassburg 1896, p. 35; Kane, H. Dh. I, ²Poona 1975, p. 625.

high official, is said to have been "fond of performing solemn rites" (Introduction, st. 6). The chief object of this famous book is to explain the meaning of the *mantras* used by brahmins who are followers of the Kāṇva recension of the White Yajurveda in their daily rites and observances (including the *saṃskāras*) "from the brushing of the teeth (in the morning) to the funeral rites". The number of *mantras* is limited to about 400 because the book is to serve the purpose of those who are unable to study more of the Veda than those parts which are applicable in the domestic rites. Since the Vājasaneyins use the Pāraskara-Gṛhyasūtra as their domestic manual most of these *mantras* are found in that work. Moreover, the author deals elaborately with the procedures to be adopted in performing the rituals as far as these require *mantras*, citing a considerable number of authoritative statements, not only from *brāhmaṇas* and *sūtras*, but also from *dharmaśāstras* and *purāṇas* with the result that his work here and there resembles a *smṛti* digest rather than a ritual commentary.

Other ritual manuals, entitled for instance Prayogacintāmaṇi "philosopher's stone of ritual practice",[75] Saṃskāramayūkha "Lustre of sacraments" (by Nīlakaṇṭha),[76] or Saṃskāraratnamālā "Jewel-necklace of sacraments",[77] generally are compilations from *sūtras*, *prayogas*, *kārikās*, *dharma* texts and astrological books. Thus, one Veṅkaṭeśa, Parameśvara's son—obviously a very learned man because he cites a considerable number of authorities—wrote a Baudhāyana-sanirṇaya-Prayogamālā.[78] Although it is the principal object of Kamalākara's Nirṇayasindhu "Ocean of the applications of conclusive arguments" (1612) to give decisive opinions on the proper times for a variety of religious performances—Vedic as well as Hindu—the author's desire to make his book encyclopaedic prompted him to include also descriptions of popular rites.[79] Anantadeva's Saṃskārakaustubha "Breast-jewel of sacraments"[80]—part of a large digest called Smṛtikaustubha—is a very popular work dealing with the (sixteen) 'sacraments'. The learned author—who also wrote several *prayogas* (Agnihotraprayoga, Cāturmāsyaprayoga)—lived in the third quarter of the 17th century. No subject being regarded as more important than the daily duties there exist under names such as Āhnikacintāmaṇi (by Vācaspatimiśra: second half of the 15th century, in Mithilā), Āhnikaprakāśa, Āhnikatattva, Chandogāhnika (by Śrīdatta ca. 1300 ?, Mithilā)[81] etc. many short, but also long com-

---

[75] Śivarāmakṛṣṇa Śāstrī's Prayogacintāmaṇi, a manual of the Āpastambins, was edited by A. Svāminātha Śāstrī, Kumbakonam 1901.

[76] Published in Bombay 1884.

[77] Gopīnātha Dīkṣita's Saṃskāraratnamālā was edited by K. Ś. Āgāśe, Poona 1899; a work of the same title by Shri Gopee Nath Bhatt Oak published by Rāma Kṛṣṇa Śāstrī, Benares 1898.

[78] Published in Bombay 1886; see also Hillebrandt, Rit., p. 39, fn. 68.

[79] Published in Bombay 1905 (Nirṇayasāgara) and elsewhere. Further information: Kane, H. Dh. I², p. 931.

[80] Published: Bombay 1913 (Nirṇayasāgara); Baroda 1914. See Kane, H. Dh. I², p. 953 and J. Jolly, in ZDMG 46, p. 277 for further information.

[81] Published: Bombay 1930 (Nirṇayasāgara). Cf. also Kane, H. Dh. I², p. 760.

pilations, among them modern works, dealing with this part of the rituals only.[82] Other compendia of this genre—mostly comparatively modern and unimportant—treat of the marriage ceremonies[83]—e.g. Vivāhapradīpa by Gaurīśa Śarma—, ritual impurity *(āśauca)* and purification—the earliest being that of Vijñāneśvara, in the beginning of the 12th century, entitled Āśaucadaśaka.[84] There are further works called Compendium or Epitome—e.g. Gṛhya-Saṃgraha[85]—as well as many collections of *mantras*, eulogies *(stotra)* and *praiṣas* for the use of officiants, often relating to a single ritual, such as the *agniṣṭoma:* for instance, an Agniṣṭomamantramālā for the *adhvaryu*.[86]

A few words remain to be said on the *pravarasūtras*. Closely related to the *śrautasūtras* to which they are appended, these texts consist of stereotyped lists of names of ancient *ṛṣis* who are assumed to have been the remote founders of brahmin families. These lists are regularly recited at specific points in the sacrificial ritual; that is to say, the *ṛṣis* of the sacrificer are to be mentioned first by the *hotar* and then by the *adhvaryu*. Since they were in all probability compiled for the use of the officiants who had to recite the correct *pravaras* and are classified according to the main exogamous families *(gotra)*, they allow us to gain an insight into the structure of the exogamous system of the ancient brahminical families,[87] on which they constitute our chief source of information. In colophons and elsewhere these lists are known as *pravarakhaṇḍa*, *-adhyāya*, or *-praśna*. Intelligibly enough, they occur only in connexion with ṛgvedic and yajurvedic *śrautasūtras*. We possess a *pravarādhyāya* for the Āśvalāyana school providing us with no more than an outline of the system; one of the Āpastambins which is very similar to the preceding one; one of the Hiraṇyakeśin tradition which is almost identical with that of Āpastamba; a much more detailed one of the Baudhāyana school and one attributed to Kātyāyana which is similar in structure, although the subfamilies mentioned diverge widely from the Baudhāyana list;[88] a Mānava account and a Vaikhānasa list which is closely related to that of Baudhāyana. It seems that all *pravara* lists are descended from the same common original which was subject to slight modifications in different parts of India. Medieval treatises on this subject are known under

[82] See HARAPRASAD SASTRI, A descriptive catalogue of Sanskrit manuscripts in the Government collection, As. Soc. of Bengal, III, Calcutta 1923, p. XXXVII; 348; for other titles also KANE, H. Dh. I, 1st ed., p. 520.

[83] Other titles: KANE, H. Dh. I, 1st ed., p. 622.

[84] Cf. KANE, H. Dh. I², p. 613.

[85] A *pariśiṣṭa* of Gobhila under this title was edited by S. SĀMAŚRAMĪ in the periodical Uṣā 1 (1891). For the Gobhila-Smṛti or Karmapradīpa, incorrectly ascribed to Kātyāyana (ed. by V. G. APTE, Smṛtīnāṃ samuccayaḥ, Poona 1929, p. 49) see KANE, H. Dh. I, 1st ed., p. 502.

[86] Some information is given by HILLEBRANDT, Rit., p. 38; 40.

[87] For this and further information see J. BROUGH, The early brahmanical system of gotra and pravara, Cambridge 1953 (criticism on Brough's Preface in D. D. KOSAMBI, Developments of the *gotra* system, in Vol. P. K. Gode, p. 215).

[88] In CALAND's list of the chapters of the Baudhāyana corpus (Über . . . Baudhāyana, p. 13) ch. 45, between the *pitṛmedha* and the *dharma* parts.

titles such as Gotranirṇaya or Gotrapravaranirṇaya.[89] One of these, Puruṣottama Paṇḍita's Gotrapravaramañjarī[90] is of special value because it quotes, while commenting on them, the most important *sūtra* texts.

Although occasional references to the *śrauta* ceremonies in later times are not wanting[91] and the epigraphic and literary records have of course preserved only the memory of the most spectacular occurrences, the number of sacrificers—now probably no more than a hundred odd[92]—has since a long time been gradually decreasing. There is indeed no doubt that already in the first millennium of the Christian era the solemn rites were declining.[93] Even in Vedic times they were not observed by every householder: the *sūtras* speak of men who do not maintain sacred fires *(anāhitāgni)*[94] and allow replacing complicated rites by simpler ones.[95] One of the factors in this process seems to have been the increasing aversion to rites involving the immolation of animals which are—also nowadays, on the very rare occasions of *śrauta* sacrifices in modern times—repugnant to most Indians. In North India, excepting a few places such as Varanasi (Benares), the tradition has become almost extinct, while in the South it still persists to a certain extent.[96] As to the *saṃskāras*, most of these have nowadays fallen into oblivion; as far as they are performed at all, they are shortened, combined or executed without Vedic *mantras*.[97] On the other hand, the growing importance of *smārta* and Hindu rituals—also attested to by inscriptions—was already at an early date attended with certain tendencies to

[89] Jīvadeva's work of this name is contained in Anantadeva's Saṃskārakaustubha.

[90] N° 1777 and 1778 in EGGELING's Catalogue of the India Office.

[91] See e.g. KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 1237 on the *aśvamedha*. No mention can be made here of the elaborate research into the Vedic rituals made and interpretations defended in the voluminous treatises of the Pūrvamīmāṃsā, according to which the main purpose of the Veda is to lay down ritual injunctions. The reader may be referred to KANE, H. Dh., passim and the handbooks of Indian philosophy.

[92] Cf. KASHIKAR, op. cit., p. 89.

[93] For the history of ritual practice see C. G. KASHIKAR, The Vedic sacrificial rituals through the ages, IA 3, 1 (1964), p. 77; V. S. PATHAK, Vedic rituals in the early medieval period, an epigraphic study, ABORI 40 (1959), p. 218; RAJATBARAN DATTARAY, Vedism in ancient Bengal, Calcutta 1974; D. BHATTACHARYYA, Brāhmaṇa-sarvasva (see n. 74 above), p. XII.

[94] E.g. BŚS. 18, 25: 373, 1; 26, 9: 285, 1; ŚS. 18, 24, 28; LŚS. 4, 4, 10.

[95] Cf. ĀśvGS. 1, 5 (4); ŚGS. 2, 17, 2; PGS. 2, 9, 16.

[96] See C. G. KASHIKAR, The present-day Vedic ritual in India, Comm. Vol. R. B. Trivedi, Madras 1958, p. 56; L. RENOU, Cérémonies védiques dans l'Inde contemporaine, Paris Acad. 1949, p. 1. For a *vājapeya* performed in Poona (1955): The Śrauta ritual and the Vājapeya Sacrifice, published by the Vājapeya performance committee, Poona 1955; Report, published by the same committee, Poona 1957 (the performance has been filmed; copies are kept in Utrecht and Chicago); of an *agnicayana-atirātra* of the Nambudiris in Panjal (Kerala, 1975) there exists a provisional report of the filming (copies in the U.S.A., Utrecht etc.): (J. F. STAAL and others) Atirātra-agnicayana, Berkeley 1975. See also J. F. STAAL, in Vol. F. B. J. Kuiper, The Hague 1968, p. 409.

[97] For details see KANE, H. Dh. II, p. 199.

combine so-called āgamic cults with Vedic elements. Unmistakable evidence of this process of assimilation, of grafting āgamic forms of worship upon the old Vedic ritual[98] is—as stated earlier—given by the later parts of the Baudhāyana collection, the Āgniveśya and the Vaikhānasa-Smārtasūtra.

In the last century new manuscripts have come to light and research has considerably progressed. As a result our knowledge of the *sūtra* literature has much advanced since the days of the pioneers who produced their works between 1880 and 1930: Garbe's edition of Āpastamba's Śrautasūtra, Oldenberg's translations of *gṛhyasūtras*, L'agniṣṭoma by Caland and Henry, and Caland's many editions, studies and translations.[99] And that, notwithstanding the interruption of these studies after Caland's death in 1932, in the last three decades, mainly through the growing interest of Indian scholars, an interest that has been roused partly by scientific motives, partly by a desire to revivify the Vedic cult which, it is hoped, can profit from a profound study of its original sources. Yet very much remains to be done. Among the many subjects for research are, besides some new editions and translations of those *sūtra* works that have not yet been rendered into English, a study of the interrelations of these texts; a renewed investigation of their absolute and relative chronology; an examination of the commentaries, the secondary literature and the citations from *sūtra* texts met with in other works;[100] reinterpretations and refashionings of *sūtras* and Vedic rituals; their survival in Hinduism and the blend of elements of *sūtra* rituals with the āgamic cults.

[98] In the Pratiṣṭhātilaka (GONDA, M. R. L., p. 283): the consecration of temples is to take place in the right Vedic fashion!

[99] For a more detailed survey see P. ROLLAND, V. G. S., p. 9.

[100] See e.g. RAGHU VIRA, in Oriental College Magazine, Lahore 1928; KASHIKAR, S. Bh. I, p. LII, LV; PARPOLA, Ś. L. D. I, 1, p. 107; cf. also L. ROCHER, The quotations from the dharmasūtras . . ., in JOIB 3 (1953), p. 1.

GLOSSARY

ācārya, teacher or spiritual guide
adhvaryu, one of the chief officiants who had to perform manual acts while muttering *yajus*
agnicayana, construction of the great fireplace
agnihotra, the daily fire cult or attendance on Agni
agnyupasthāna, worship of Agni
āgrahāyaṇī, one of the seven *pākayajñas*
āhitāgni, a man who maintains perpetual sacred fires
anāhitāgni, the man who does not maintain perpetual sacred fires
anuṣṭubh, a stanza consisting of four feet *(pāda)* of eight syllables each
argha, respectful reception of a guest
bali, offering, esp. of a portion of food offered on the ground for all kinds of beings
brahmatva(m), in the *śrauta* ritual the function of the *brahman* (one of the chief priests) and his assistants
cayana = *agnicayana*
cūḍā or *caula*, the tonsure ceremony
cūḍākaraṇa, the ceremony of tonsure
dakṣiṇā, offering presented to an officiating priest
darśapūrṇamāsau, rites of full and new moon
eke, some (authorities)
gāna, the song-books of the Sāmaveda containing the melodies
godāna, the ceremony of hair-cutting
gotra, family, lineage
hautra(m), the function of the *hotar* and his assistants
hotar, one of the chief priests (*śrauta* ritual), in charge of the recitation of the Ṛgveda
hotraka, an assistant of the *hotar*
iṣṭi, a type of *śrauta* sacrifice (opposed to animal and *soma* sacrifices)
jyotiṣṭoma, the general name of the *soma* festivals that last one day
kalpa, ritual practice
kāmya rites *(kāmyeṣṭi)*, rites for special advantages
madhuparka, a mixture of honey etc. respectfully offered to a guest and the ceremony of receiving a guest with it
pākayajña, a domestic sacrifice
paśubandhu, animal sacrifice
pradakṣiṇa, reverentially turning the right side towards a person of object, circumambulation from left to right
prāksoma, the portion of a *śrautasūtra* which precedes the sections on the *soma* sacrifices
prāṇāgnihotra, symbolical *agnihotra*; a definite rite in which food is offered within the sacrificer himself; also various symbolical and esoteric ritual speculations
praśna, (interrogation; point at issue;) section (of a book)
prastara, couch, sacrificial seat
pratīkena, (quoted) with the first words, not in full
prātiśākhya, ancillary text explaining the changes necessary for constituting a Vedic *saṃhitā* text on the basis of the *padapāṭha*

prāyaścitta, expiation
prayoga, course of proceeding, sacrificial performance
pūjā, Hindu (non-Vedic) worship
rājasūya, royal consecration
ṛṣi, inspired sage seer and poet of a Vedic text
śākhā, a 'branch' or tradition of the Veda
sāman, sacred text or stanza to be sung to fixed melodies; a melody to which such a text is sung
samāvartana, the return home of a young member of the Aryan classes after completing his study of the Veda
saṃdhi, *sandhi*, euphonic combination of final and initial sounds of words and elements of words
saṃhitā, a methodically arranged collection of texts
saṃnyāsin, an ascetic who abandons or resigns all wordly affairs or concerns
saṃskāra, 'sacrament', 'ceremony leading to perfection and accomplishment' by which a human being, body, mind and soul, is raised to a higher state of perfection, so that he will be able to come up to the requirements of the next phase of his existence
śānti, appeasement of evil
sattra, a *soma* sacrifice lasting from 13 to 100 days
śmaśāna, place for burning dead bodies
snātaka, a young member of the three Aryan classes who, having performed the ceremonial lustrations after completing his study, returns home and begins the second period of his life as a householder
soma, the *soma* plant and its juice, offered in libations to the gods; the elixir of life
śrāddha, a ceremony for the benefit of the dead ancestors observed at fixed periods as well as on occasions of mourning or rejoicing
śruti, that which has been heard, i.e. the sacred knowledge of the *ṛṣis*, orally transmitted by brahmins; the eternal and infallible truth which is embodied in the Veda
sthālīpāka, oblation consisting of rice or barley boiled in milk
subrahmaṇya, one of the four chanters (*śrauta* ritual)
sūtrakāra, author or compiler of a *sūtra* work
udgātar, the chanter, one of the chief priests of the *śrauta* ritual
ukthya, a *soma* sacrifice characterized by fifteen hymns of praise and fifteen invocations
upanayana, the reception of a youth by a brahmin teacher who is to initiate him in the Veda
vidhi, rule, (ritual) precept, direction (esp. for the performance of a rite)
vrata, fixed and regular behaviour, rule of conduct, observance, function
vṛtti, brief explanation
vyākhyā, explanation, comment, paraphrase
yajus, sacrificial formula

ABBREVIATIONS

I. Texts (original sources)

ĀgnGS.	Āgniveśya-Gṛhyasūtra
AiB.	Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa
ĀpDhS.	Āpastamba-Dharmasūtra
ĀpGS.	Āpastamba-Gṛhyasūtra
ĀpMB. or ĀpMP.	Āpastamba-Mantrapāṭha (see **MP.**)
ĀpPMS.	Āpastamba-Pitṛmedhāsūtra
ĀpSmPr.	Āpastamba-Smārtaprayoga
ĀpŚS.	Āpastamba-Śrautasūtra
ĀpYPS.	Āpastamba-Yajña-Paribhāṣāsūtra
ĀśvGS.	Āśvalāyana-Gṛhyasūtra
ĀśvŚS.	Āśvalāyana-Śrautasūtra
AVPar.	Pariśiṣṭas of the Atharvaveda
AV(Ś).	Atharvaveda-Saṃhitā, Śaunakīya recension
BĀU.	Bṛhad-Āraṇyaka-Upaniṣad
BD.	Bṛhaddevatā
BDhŚ. or **BaudhDhŚ.**	Baudhāyana-Dharmaśāstra
BGPS.	Baudhāyana-Gṛhya-Paribhāṣāsūtra
BGS.	Baudhāyana-Gṛhyasūtra
BGŚS.	Baudhāyana-Gṛhya-Śeṣasūtra
BhGS. or **BhārGS.**	Bhāradvāja-Gṛhyasūtra
BhParS.	Bhāradvāja-Pariśeṣasūtra
BhPMS.	Bhāradvāja-Pitṛmedha (Paitṛmedhika)**sūtra**
BhŚS.	Bhāradvāja-Śrautasūtra
BPMS.	Baudhāyana-Pitṛmedhasūtra
BŚS.	Baudhāyana-Śrautasūtra
DŚS.	Drāhyāyaṇa-Śrautasūtra
GGS.	Gobhila-Gṛhyasūtra
GSP. or **GGSPar.**	Gobhila-Gṛhya-Saṃgraha-Pariśiṣṭa
HDhS.	Hiraṇyakeśi-Dharmasūtra
HGS.	Hiraṇyakeśi-Gṛhyasūtra
HPMS.	Hiraṇyakeśi-Pitṛmedhasūtra
HŚS.	Hiraṇyakeśi-Śrautasūtra
JB.	Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa
JGS.	Jaiminīya-Gṛhyasūtra
JŚS.	Jaiminīya-Śrautasūtra
KāGS.	Kāṭhaka-Gṛhyasūtra
KapS.	Kapiṣṭhala-Saṃhitā
KāṭhGS.	see KāGS.
KauṣGS.	Kauṣītaka-Gṛhyasūtra
Kauś(S).	Kauśika-Sūtra
KauṣUp.	Kauṣītaki-Upaniṣad
KauthGS.	Kauthuma-Gṛhyasūtra
KB.	Kauṣītaki- or Śāṅkhāyana-**Brāhmaṇa**
KGS.	Kauthuma-Gṛhyasūtra
KhGS.	Khādira-Gṛhyasūtra
KS.	Kāṭhaka-Saṃhitā

KŚS.	Kātyāyana-Śrautasūtra
KṣS.	Kṣudrasūtra
LGS.	Laugākṣi-Gṛhyasūtra
LŚS.	Lāṭyāyana-Śrautasūtra
MB.	Mantra-Brāhmaṇa
Mbh.	Mahābhārata
MDhŚ.	Mānava-Dharmaśāstra (Manu)
MGS.	Mānava-Gṛhyasūtra
MP.	Mantrapāṭha of the Āpastambins
MS.	Maitrāyaṇi-Saṃhitā
MŚS.	Mānava-Śrautasūtra
Par.	Pariśiṣṭa
PB.	Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa
PGS.	Pāraskara-Gṛhyasūtra
ṚV.	Ṛgveda-Saṃhitā
S.	Sūtra
ŚāmbGS.	Śāmbavya-Gṛhyasūtra
ŚB.	Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa
ŚGS.	Śāṅkhāyana-Gṛhyasūtra
SMB.	Sāma-Mantra-Brāhmaṇa
SmS.	Smārtasūtra
ŚŚS.	Śāṅkhāyana-Śrautasūtra
TĀ.	Taittirīya-Āraṇyaka
TB.	Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa
TS.	Taittirīya-Saṃhitā
Up.	Upaniṣad
VādhŚS.	Vādhūla-Śrautasūtra
VaikhGS.	Vaikhānasa-Gṛhyasūtra
VaikhSmS.	Vaikhānasa-Smārtasūtra
VaikhŚS.	Vaikhānasa-Śrautasūtra
VaitS.	Vaitāna-Sūtra
VārGS.	Vārāha-Gṛhyasūtra
VārŚS.	Vārāha-Śrautasūtra
VāsDhŚ.	Vāsiṣṭha-Dharmaśāstra
VGS.	see VārGS.
VS.	Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā
VSK.	Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā, Kāṇva-Śākhā
VSmS.	see VaikhSmS.
VŚS.	see VārŚS.
Yājñ.	Yājñavalkya-Smṛti

II. Abbreviated titles of books mentioned in the footnotes

The bibliographical references in the footnotes are only a selection. For complete and systematic lists of books and articles see the very reliable bibliographies by L. Renou, Bibliographie védique, Paris 1931 and R. N. Dandekar, Vedic Bibliography, 3 vol., Bombay 1946; Poona 1961 and 1973.

Bloomfield, Edition or KauśS.	M. Bloomfield, The Kauśikasūtra of Atharva Veda, New Haven 1890; Delhi 1972
Caland, Ahnenkult	W. Caland, Altindischer Ahnenkult, Leiden 1893
Caland, (Altind.) Zauberritual	W. Caland, Altindisches Zauberritual. Übersetzung der wichtigsten Theile des Kauśika Sūtra, Amsterdam Acad. 1900

Caland, Ārṣeyakalpa	W. Caland, Der Ārṣeyakalpa des Sāmaveda, AKM, Leipzig 1908
Caland, A. Z.	W. Caland, Altindische Zauberei, Darstellung der altindischen "Wunschopfer", Amsterdam Acad. 1908
Caland, Bijdrage . . . Atharvaveda	W. Caland, Bijdrage tot de kennis der Atharvaveda-literatuur, Amsterdam Acad. 1904
Caland, J. G. S.	W. Caland, Jaiminigṛhyasūtra, Lahore 1922
Caland, P. B.	W. Caland, Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa (translated), Calcutta 1931
Caland, P. M. S.	W. Caland, The Pitṛmedhasūtras of Baudhāyana, Hiraṇyakeśin, Gautama edited, Leipzig 1896 (²1966)
Caland, Ś. Ā.	W. Caland, Das Śrautasūtra des Āpastamba, 3 volumes, I Göttingen and Leipzig 1921; II and III Amsterdam Acad. 1924; 1928; reprint Wiesbaden 1969
Caland, Ś. Ś. S.	W. Caland, Śāṅkhāyana-Śrautasūtra, edited by Lokesh Chandra, Nagpur 1953
Caland, Über . . . Baudhāyana	W. Caland, Über das rituelle Sūtra des Baudhāyana, AKM, Leipzig 1903; reprint 1966
Caland, VaikhSmS.	W. Caland, Vaikhānasasmārtasūtram, Calcutta 1929
Caland and Henry, L'agniṣṭoma	W. Caland and V. Henry, L'agniṣṭoma, 2 vol., Paris 1906; 1907
C. H. I.	Cambridge History of India
Dresden, M. G. S.	M. J. Dresden, Mānavagṛhyasūtra, Thesis Utrecht 1941
Dumont, L'agnihotra	P. E. Dumont, L'agnihotra. Description de l'agnihotra dans le rituel védique, Baltimore 1939
Eggeling, ŚB.	J. Eggeling, The Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa (Mādhyandina School, translated), The Sacred Books of the East, 5 vol., Oxford 1882—1900; ²Delhi 1963; ³Delhi 1966
Gaastra, B. K. V. R.	D. Gaastra, Bijdrage tot de kennis van het Vedische ritueel. Jaiminīyaśrautasūtra, Thesis Utrecht 1906
Gaastra, J. Ś. S.	see Gaastra, B. K. V. R.
Garbe, ĀpŚS.	The Śrauta Sūtra of Āpastamba . . . edited by R. Garbe, 3 vol., B. I., Calcutta 1882; 1885; 1902
Van Gelder, Hoogaltaar	J. M. van Gelder, Opbouw van het hoogaltaar naar de overlevering der Mānavas (Mānava Śrauta-sūtra cayana) (with an introduction in German), Thesis Utrecht 1921
v. Glasenapp, L. I.	H. v. Glasenapp, Die Literaturen Indiens, Stuttgart 1961
Gonda, Aspects	J. Gonda, Aspects of early Visnuism, Utrecht 1954; ²Delhi 1969
Gonda, Dual deities	J. Gonda, The dual deities in the religion of the Veda, Amsterdam Acad. 1974
Gonda, M. R. L.	J. Gonda, Medieval Religious Literature in Sanskrit, in Vol. II of this History
Gonda, R. I.	J. Gonda, Die Religionen Indiens, I, Stuttgart 1960
Gonda, Savayajñas	J. Gonda, The Savayajñas (Kauśikasūtra 60—68), Amsterdam Acad. 1965
Gonda, S. S.	J. Gonda, Selected Studies, 5 vol., Leiden 1975
Gonda, V. L.	J. Gonda, Vedic literature (Saṃhitās and Brāhmaṇas), Wiesbaden 1975
Gopal, I. V. K.	Ram Gopal, India of Vedic Kalpasūtras, Delhi 1959

Haug, Ai. B.	M. Haug, The Aitareya Brāhmaṇam of the Rigveda, 2 vol., Bombay 1863; II ²Allahabad 1922
Hillebrandt, N. V. M.	A. Hillebrandt, Das altindische Neu- und Vollmondsopfer, Jena 1880
Hillebrandt, Rit. or Ritualliteratur	A. Hillebrandt, Ritualliteratur. Vedische Opfer und Zauber, Strassburg 1897
Hillebrandt, Ś. Ś. S.	Śāṅkhāyana-Śrautasūtra (with commentaries) edited by A. Hillebrandt, 4 vol., B. I., Calcutta 1885—1899
Kane, H. Dh.	P. V. Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, 5 vol. (7 parts), Poona 1930—1962; 2nd ed. and reprint 1968—1974
Kashikar, S. Bh.	C. G. Kashikar, The Sūtras of Bhāradvāja, I Text, II Translation, Poona 1964
Kashikar, S. Ś.	C. G. Kashikar, A survey of the Śrautasūtras, Journal of the Univ. of Bombay 35 (N. S.), 2, Arts 41, 1966, also separately, Univ. of Bombay 1968
Keith, R. B.	A. B. Keith, Rigveda Brahmanas, Cambridge Mass. 1920
Keith, R. Ph. V. U.	A. B. Keith, Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads, Cambridge Mass. 1925; Delhi 1969
Keith, V. B. Y. S.	A. B. Keith, The Veda of the Black Yajus School entitled Taittirīya Sanhitā (translated), Cambridge Mass. 1914
Macdonell, H. S. L.	A. A. Macdonell, A history of Sanskrit literature, London 1900; ²1925; New York 1929; Delhi 1958; 1961
N. C. C.	New Catalogus Catalogorum, I, Madras 1968 (revised edition); II 1966 etc.
Oldenberg, G. S.	H. Oldenberg, The Grihya-sūtras, 2 vol., S. B. E. XXIX and XXX, Oxford 1886; 1892; Delhi 1964
Parpola, J. A.	A. Parpola, On the Jaiminīyaśrautasūtra and its annexes, Orientalia Suecana 16 (1967), p. 181
Parpola, L. S. J. S.	A. Parpola, The literature and study of the Jaiminīya Sāmaveda, Helsinki 1973
Parpola, Ś. L. D.	A. Parpola, The Śrautasūtras of Lāṭyāyana and Drāhyāyaṇa and their commentaries, I, 1 General Introduction, Commentationes humanarum literarum, Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 42, 2, Helsinki 1968
Pillai, N. M.	P. K. Narayana Pillai, Non-Ṛgvedic mantras in the marriage ceremonies, Trivandrum 1958
Renou, Bibl(iographie)	L. Renou, Bibliographie védique, Paris 1931
Renou, Écoles	L. Renou, Les écoles védiques et la formation du Veda, Paris 1947
Renou, E. V. P.	L. Renou, Études védiques et pāṇinéennes, 17 vol., Paris 1955—1969
Renou, H. L. S.	L. Renou, Histoire de la langue sanskrite, Lyon-Paris 1956
Renou(-Filliozat), I. C.	L. Renou and J. Filliozat, L'Inde classique, I, Paris 1947; II, Paris and Hanoi 1953
Rolland, R. D. V.	P. Rolland, Un rituel domestique védique. Le Vārāhagṛhyasūtra, Aix-en-Provence 1971
Salomons, BhGS. or Bhāradvāja	H. J. W. Salomons, Het Hindoesche huisritueel volgens de school van Bhāradvāja, Thesis Utrecht 1913
S. B. E.	Sacred Books of the East, 50 volumes, Oxford
Schwab, Thieropfer	J. Schwab, Das altindische Thieropfer, Erlangen 1886
Sehgal. Ś, G. S.	S. R. Sehgal, Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, Delhi 1960

Singh, C. S. KŚS. or K. Ś. S.	K. P. Singh, A critical study of the Kātyāyana Śrauta-sūtra, Varanasi (Benares) 1969
Śrautakośa	Śrautakośa, Encyclopaedia of Vedic sacrificial ritual. Sanskrit section (by C. G. Kashikar), I, Poona 1958; II, 1970; English section (by R. N. Dandekar), I, Poona 1958; II, 1962
Vol. Kavirāj	(Gopināth) Kavirāj Abhinandana Grantha, Lucknow 1967
Vol. Raghavan	Sanskrit and Indological Studies, Felicitation Volume V. Raghavan, Delhi 1975
Vol. Raghu Vira	Raghu Vira Memorial Volume, ed. D. Sinor, New Delhi 1968
Vol. Renou	Mélanges d'Indianisme à la mémoire de Louis Renou, Paris 1968
Weber, I. L.	A. Weber, Akademische Vorlesungen über indische Literaturgeschichte, ²Berlin 1876
Weber, I. S.	A. Weber, Indische Studien, 18 vol., Berlin 1849—1898
Winternitz, G. I. L.	M. Winternitz, Geschichte der indischen Literatur, I, Leipzig 1905, ²1909
Winternitz, H. I. L.	M. Winternitz, A history of Indian Literature, I, Calcutta 1927 (Engl. transl. by Mrs. S. Ketkar); ²1959
Winternitz, Hochzeitsrituell	M. Winternitz, Das altindische Hochzeitsrituell nach dem Āpastambīya-Gṛhyasūtra . . ., Denkschriften Wiener Akad. 40, Vienna 1892

III. Periodicals etc.

Abh. böhm. Ges.	Abhandlungen der böhmischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Prague
ABORI	Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona
AIOC	All India Oriental Conference (Proceedings of the)
AKM	Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes herausgegeben von der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Leipzig
ALB	Adyar Library Bulletin, Adyar-Madras
AO (Lugd.)	Acta Orientalia, Leiden, Copenhague
ArchRel	Archiv für Religionswissenschaft, Berlin and Leipzig
BDCRI	Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute, Poona
B. I.	Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta
BSL	Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris
BSO(A)S	Bulletin of the School of Oriental (and African) Studies, London
BTLV	Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde, The Hague
CASS	Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, Univ. of Poona
GGA	Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen, Göttingen
H. C. I. P.	History and Culture of the Indian People, (I, The Vedic Age) edited by R. C. Majumdar and A. D. Pusalker, London 1951
IA	Indian Antiquary, Bombay
IC	Indian Culture, Calcutta

IHQ	Indian Historical Quarterly, Calcutta
IIJ	Indo-Iranian Journal, The Hague
Int. Congr. Or.	International Congress of Orientalists
JA	Journal asiatique, Paris
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society, New Haven, Baltimore
JASBo(mbay)	Journal of the Asiatic Society, Bombay
JB(o)BRAS	Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society
JGJRI	Journal of the Ganganatha Jha Research Institute, or J. G. J. Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, Allahabad
JOIB	Journal of the Oriental Institute, Baroda
JORM	Journal of Oriental Research, Madras
JRAS	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, London
JUPHS	Journal of the University of Poona, Humanities Section, Poona
JVS	Journal of Vedic Studies, Lahore
MIO	Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung, Berlin
MO	Le monde oriental, Uppsala
MSS	Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft
NIA	New Indian Antiquary, Bombay
OH	Our Heritage, Calcutta
Oriens	Istanbul, Leiden
OS	Orientalia Suecana, Uppsala
OT	Oriental Thought, Nasik
PAPhA	Proceedings of the American Philosophical Association, Philadelphia
QJMS	Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society, Bangalore
SB	Sitzungsberichte
SII	Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik, Reinbek (Germany)
TSS	Trivandrum Sanskrit Series
VIJ	Vishveshvaranand Indological Journal, Hoshiarpur
WZKM	Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, Vienna
ZDMG	Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Leipzig, Wiesbaden
ZII	Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik, Leipzig
ZMR	Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft, Münster

IV. General

a.	adhyāya
Acad.	Academy
comm.	commentary
ed.	edited, edition, editor
Univ.	University
Vol.	Volume

INDEX

The order is that of the Roman alphabet. The numbers refer to pages, numbers before n. to a footnote on the page mentioned. The Glossary and the Bibliography are not indexed, the footnotes and technical terms relating to rites and sacrifices only sporadically.

abbreviations 509
abhicaraṇīya(s) 535
abhyātāna 549 n.
ābhyudayika 564, 584
abridgment 482
absolutives 634
ācārya 483 n., 564
adaptation 503, 504, 507, 571, 572f.
additions (to texts etc.) 479, 498 n., 507, 513, 539, 586, 607, 617, 640, 646, 648
adhikāra 638 n.
ādhvaryava 472, 493
adhvaryu 472, 473, 480, 493, 530, 633
Aditi 577f.
Ādityadarśana 598f.
aetiology 592
āgamas 586, 661
Agastya-Sūtra 489 n.
Agni 467, 515, 568, 577, 597, 599, 626
Agni and Soma 489
agnicayana 491, 492, 505 n., 527, 542, 660 n.
agnihotra 468, 491, 492, 515, 534, 544 n., 561, 563, 624, 631
Agnihotracandrika 655 n.
Agnihotraprayoga 658
agnimukhya 587
agniṣṭoma 468, 489, 492, **517, 519, 526,** 542, 545, 656
Agniṣṭomamantramālā 659
Agniṣṭoma-Paddhati 654
Agniṣṭoma-Prayoga 543, 656
Agnisvāmin 536 n., 540 n., 649, 652
Agniveśya 522 n.
Āgniveśya(s) 474, 483, 522, 593, 616, 661
Āgniveśya-Gṛhyasūtra 481, 573, 586, 592, 619f., 641
Āgniveśyaka-Sūtra 489 n.
agnyādhāna, agnyādheya 491, 492, 498 n., 523, 585
agnyupasthāna 491, 515
āgrahāyaṇī 563f.
āgrayaneṣṭi 468, 499, 515, 549 n., **551,** 563
agricultural rites 547, 562f., 571
agriculture 577 n., 622, 627
ahīna 493ff.
Āhnikacintāmaṇi 658
Āhnikaprakāśa 658
Āhnikatattva 658
ahuta 556, 582, 583
Aitareya 476 n.
Aitareya-Āraṇyaka 471, 475 n., 533
Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa 499, 531ff., 534, 547, 606 n.
Aitareya-Gṛhyasūtra 607 n.
Aitareyins 508, 532
Ālekhana 486, 519 n., 520, 524, 550 n.
alternative prescripts, ritual act 484, 497, 631, 640
ambiguities 472
amplifications 499, 540, 553
amulets 567
anachronisms 652
anacoluthon 634
Anākula 651
Anantadeva 658
Anantayajvan 620
Ānartīya 530 n.
ancestors (deceased) **515, 563, 583, 624**
Āṇḍapilla 657
Āṅgirasa 550 n.
Āṅgirasakalpa 615
animal sacrifice (see also ***paśubandha***) 489, 491, 492, 496, 577 n.
aṅkurārpaṇa 589, 656
annaprāśana 558, 567
anonymity 545
Antyeṣṭi-Paddhati 654
anukramaṇī 537
anumantraṇa 543f., 545

Anupada(-Sūtra) 536, 540
Anustotra(-Sūtra) 536
anuṣṭubh 478 n.
anuvāka 502
anuvṛtti 631
anvākhyāna(s) 523, 524, 529 n., 551
anvaṣṭakya 564
Aparārka 598 n., 603
Āpastamba 473, 474, 476, 477 and n., 482, 483, 485, 486, 488, 490, 498, 506, 509, 513, 514, 519ff., 522, 523, 525, 526, 554, 555, 578, 579, 618, 629, 643, 650f.
Āpastamba-Dharmasūtra 488, 555, 591
Āpastamba-Gṛhyasūtra 511, 521, 549, 553 n., 555, 579, 590f., 592, 647, 651
Āpastamba-Hautra-Pariśiṣṭas 513
Āpastamba-Pitṛmedhasūtra 618, 619, 650
Āpastamba-Smārtaprayoga 656
Āpastamba-Śrautasūtra 482, 493, 498, 499, 500, 501, 503, 505, 506, 518, 520, 521, 543, 591, 624, 632, 650, 657, 661
Āpastamba-Śulvasūtra 591
Āpastambasūtradhvanitārthakārikā 655 n.
Āpastambins, Āpastambīyas 517, 520, 524 n., 579, 592, 618, 655 n., 659
Āpastambīya-Kalpasūtra 591
aphorism 465, 649
aphoristic style 622
Appaya Dīkṣita 593
Apte, V. M. 604
āraṇyaka 527, 585, 609 n.
archaic style 512, 523, 606
archaisms 477, 523, 644
Ārcika 537, 538 n.
arghya 469
argumentation 585, 633
arkavivāha, arkodvāha 589, 608, 656
arrangement 536, 538, 560, 561, 600 n., 609, 611, 612, 618, 630, 646
Ārṣeyakalpa 534ff., 537
arthavāda 498
Āryavarta 487
Aśani 563
Āśārka 610
Āśaucadaśaka 659
ascetics 596
Asita Turaṅga 551 n.
Āśmarathya 486, 519 n., 520, 524, 532 n., 550 n.
aṣṭakā festivals, *aṣṭakāhoma* 564, 583, 584, 608
Aṣṭāvakra 550 n., 600
astrology 555, 651, 654, 658
astronomy 623
Āśvalāyana 474, 475, 477 n., 483, 484, 486, 487, 509, 552, 554, 560, 572, 591, 605, 616, 620, 659
Āśvalāyana-Gṛhyakārikā 657
Āśvalāyana-Gṛhya-Pariśiṣṭa 513, 605, 655
Āśvalāyana-Gṛhyasūtra 513, 548, 551, 554, 564, 568, 576, 577, 578, 603ff., 606, 620, 624, 642
Āśvalāyana-Mantrasaṃhitā 581
Āśvalayanāparaprayoga 656 n.
Āśvalāyanaprayogadīpikā 656 n.
Āśvalāyana recension 532
Āśvalāyana-Śrautasūtra 490, 499, 505, 506, 507, 508, 526, 529, 531ff., 577, 603, 605, 624, 631, 632, 633, 642, 646f., 650
aśvamedha (see also horse sacrifice) 469, 491, 525, 539, 660 n.
āśvayujī 563
Aśvins 563
atha 638 n., 639
atharvanic character of *gṛhyasūtras* 613 n.
Atharvaṇīya-Paddhati 654
Atharvaveda, Atharvaveda-Saṃhitā 472, 478, 497 n., 504, 543ff., 549, 572, 573, 574, 575f., 576 n., 579, 580, 612ff.
Atharvaveda (Paippalāda) 512, 612
Atharvaveda-Pariśiṣṭas 513 n., 590, 614
Atharvavedasya antyeṣṭikarma 654
atharvavedin(s) 495, 543, 545
Ātreya 550 n.
Ātreyī *śākhā* 579
Atri-Saṃhitā 595 n.
audgātra 472
Aukheyasūtra 524f.
Aupamanyava 484
Aupamanyavīputra 484
aupānuvākyam 515
aupāsana fire 519, 585, 588, 590
authenticity 649
author(s) 474ff., 487, 516, 537, 552, 554, 555, 556, 645
authorities (see also teachers), authority 483, 503, 519, 532, 540, 550, 567, 582, 607, 631, 640, 651, 652, 653
authorship 475, 650 n.
avāntaradīkṣā 519, 583
āyatana 584
āyuṣyacaru 584

Bādari 550 n.
bahiṣpavamānastotra 542
Bahvṛcas 520
Baijavāpa(s) 603
Baijavāpa-Gṛhyasūtra 603
Baijavāpa-Kalpasūtra 603
Baijavāpāyana 603 n.
baliharaṇa 582, 584, 604 n.
bali ritual 547, 556, 561, 563, 587, 601, 619
Bāṣkala recension 531, 606
Baudhāyana 471, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477 n., 478 n., 482, 483 n., 484f., 486, 490, 493, 505, 507, 509, 513, 514, 516, 517, 518ff., 522f., 525, 528, 543, 552, 554, 556, 580, 582 n., 583, 584, 586, 592, 595 n., 596, 611, 616, 617, 620, 629, 631, 637, 640, 643, 644, 645, 652, 656, 659
Baudhāyana corpus 517, 524, 582 n., 617, 646, 661
Baudhāyana-Dharmasūtra 646
Baudhāyana-Gṛhya-Paribhāṣāsūtra 479 n., 584f., 590
Baudhāyana-Gṛhya-Pariśiṣṭa-(Śeṣa-) Sūtra 513, 586ff., 590
Baudhāyana-Gṛhyasūtra 514, 553 n., 582ff., 617, 641
Baudhāyana-Pitṛmedhasūtra 582, 593, 616, 617
Baudhāyana-Śrautasūtra 482, 483, 488, 492 n., 498, 499, 501, 509, 513, 514ff., 519, 522, 543, 641, 645f.
Baudhāyana-Sūtras 473
Baudhāyanīya(s) 608
Baudhāyanīya-Paddhati 654
Baudhāyanīya-Pitṛmedhasūtra **617**
benediction 569
betel 481
Bhaga 563
Bhagavadgītā 589
Bhāllavika-Brāhmaṇa 487
Bhāllaviśākhā 537
Bharadvāja, Bhāradvāja 474, 477 n., 478 n., 482, 485, 490, 493, 500, 518ff., 521, 524 n., 580, 592, 602, 616, 618, 619, 651
Bhāradvāja-Gṛhyasūtra 553 n., 590
Bhāradvāja-Paitṛmedhika-(Pitṛmedha) sūtra 518, 522, 616, 618, 619
Bhāradvāja-Pariśeṣasūtra 518, 519
Bhāradvāja-Śrautasūtra 482, 500, 502, 518, 520, 521f., 590, 637
Bhāradvāja-Sūtra 489 n.
Bhāradvājasūtra-Śrāddhaprayogaḥ 656 n.
Bhāradvājins 619 n.
Bhāskara Bhaṭṭa 654
bhāṣya 590, 599, 615, 650
Bhaṭṭa(s) 656
Bhaṭṭa Kumārila 603
Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa 609 n.
Bhavadeva 654
Bhavasvāmin 517, 646, 650
Bhavatrāta 542, 657
Bhṛgu(s) 522, 561
Bhūtotpatti-Pariśiṣṭa 601 n.
birth 575 n.
birth ceremonies 557f.
birthday sacrifice 584
Black Yajurveda 482, 483, 490, **505**, 522, 580, 598f., 618
blessing 570
Bloomfield, M. 543, 612, 614
Bodhāyana (see also Baudhāyana) **484**, 514
Bodhāyanīya-Sūtra 489 n.
brahmacārin 547, 551
brahmacarya 585
brahmamedha 617, 619
Brahman 597
brahman (priest) 472, 493, 543f.
brāhmaṇa(s) 468, 470f., 474, 478 n., 479, 481 n., 482, 483, 485, 486f., 487 n., 489, 491, 495, 496ff., 502, 509 n., 515, 519, 521, 523, 525, 527, 533, 537, 540, 547, 548, 549, 550f., 565, 571, 575, 586, 592, 595, 632, 637, 640, 641, 642, 644, 655 n., 658
brāhmaṇa (secondary) 524
Brāhmaṇabala 599, 647
Brāhmaṇasarvasva 654 n., 657f.
brāhmaṇa style 471, 482, 512, 524, 526, 529, 534 n., 536, 542, 585, 629, 637, 640, 643
brahmatva 472, 538, 543f.
brahmaudana 588
brahmin(s) 485, 487, 550, 556, 558, 563, 574, 582 n., 583, 589, 598, 623, 625, 648
brahmodya 571
brevity 465f., 515, 542, 629ff.
Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad 593
Bṛhaddevatā 504
Bṛhaspati 566
bridal procession 570
bride 555, 584, 587, 589, 591, 625
Buddhism 471 n., 477f.
Bühler, G. 475, 488, 582, 585, 591

Caitra 597
caitya sacrifice 560
Caland, W. 472, 475f., 496, 514, 516, 517, 522, 523, 526, 530, 537, 543, 571 n., 580, 582, 609, 612, 620, 641, 661
Caraṇavyūha 524 n., 603, 608
Cārāyaṇīya-Kāṭhakas 599 n.
castes 481 n.
catalogues 551f., 648 n.
cattle 562f.
cattle-breeding 577 n.
caturhotar formulas 594
Cāturhotṛka 601 n.
Cāturmāsyaprayoga 658
Cauṇḍapācārya 618
cayana (rites) 516, 521, 526
Chāgaleya-Brāhmaṇa 486
Chandoga-Brāhmaṇa 486
Chandogāhnika 658
Chandoga-Paddhati 654
Chandoga-Śrāddhakalpa 620
Chandogasūtrasya dīpa 650
Chandogasya pradīpasya vṛtti 657
Chāndogya-Pariśiṣṭa 601 n.
Chando'nukramaṇī 601 n.
chant(s) 538, 542
characterization 506, 633
charms 547, 612, 613, 615
chiasmus 636 n., 637
child 557f.
choosing priests 549 n., 551
chronology 476ff., 501, 518 n., 554, 580, 607, 609 n., 623, 630, 661
circular composition 639
circumambulation 547, 559, 616
circumstantiality 629, 632
civilization (history of) 622ff.
classes of society 481 n.
classification 489
closing (formulas etc.) 637, 639
cohabitation 557, 560
Colebrooke, H. T. 654
colophon(s) 526, 530, 535, 545, 648
commentaries, commentators 472, 475, 487, 491, 550 n., 553, 557 n., 590, 592, 599, 604 n., 610, 629 n., 631, 649ff., 661
common tradition 613 n.
comparison 636
compilation 540, 553, 586, 589
compiler(s) 509, 513, 516, 522, 534, 565, 566, 575, 576, 577, 578, 580, 582, 584, 596, 600, 601
complementary *sūtra* works 606
composition 466, VI
compounds 644, 645
concentration 643
conception 557, 575 n.
conciseness, condensation 466, 498 n., 508, 515, 518, 527, 543, 555, 591, 608, 611, 629, 635, 643
consecration 504, 519, 557
consecratory formula 501, 504, 505
consecratory *mantras* 568
contagion 617
contradictions 472, 485, 652
controversies 541
co-ordination by means of a *mantra* 569
corruptions 648, 649 n.
cow(s) 480, 562f., 576
cremation 519, 616ff., 620
cross references 516, 522, 548, 635
crossroads 518, 565
cūḍākaraṇa, cūḍākarma(n) 558, 560, 561, 567, 583

daily life 623
dākṣāyaṇa sacrifice 519
dakṣiṇā 469, 513
Daṇḍin 540 n.
Dārila 615
darśapūrṇamāsau, see full moon and new moon sacrifices
Daśakarmāṇi 654 n.
Daśakarmāṇi brahmavedoktāni 654
death 469, 589, 598, 616
definitions 584, 598, 632 n., 638
deity 505
demons 627f.
description 630
descriptive *mantras* 569
deva 467
Devapāla 527, 599, 649 n.
Devasvāmin 475, 604, 650
Dhānañjaya 485, 486, 538, 539, 540
Dhānañjayya 485 n.
Dhanvin 539 n., 650
dharma 548, 550, 562, 590, 592, 595, 599, 657, 658
dharma period (so-called) 479
dharmaśāstra(s) 658
dharmasūtra(s), *dharma* works 467 n., 468, 469, 471, 473, 474, 478, 480, 554f., 590, 593, 595, 603, 604
Dhaumya 551 n.
Dhūrtasvāmin 518, 520 n., 650
didactic style 509

differences between *gṛhyasūtras* 559ff.
differences of opinion 483ff., 512f., 516
different forms of a *mantra* 506ff.
diffuseness 515, 518, 615
digressions 611, 643
dīkṣā 493
Dīkṣitarāmakṛṣṇa 610
dilemma 498
discrepancies 498 n.
discussions 473, 526, 529, 584
disease 627
disposal of the dead 546f.
divaḥśyeni iṣṭi(s) 527
divination 577 n.
division (of *sūtra* works) 646f.
domestic fire 519, 560, 561, 568, 582, 587, 597, 602, 614, 617 n.
domestic *mantras* 565ff.
domestic manuals (see also *gṛhyasūtras*) 545, 548
domestic rites 468f., 524, 546ff., 572ff., 582ff., 656
Drāhyāyaṇa 485, 487, 537, 609 n., 657
Drāhyāyaṇa-Gṛhyapariśiṣṭasūtra 611
Drāhyāyaṇa-Gṛhyasūtra 611
Drāhyāyaṇa-Śrautasūtra 490, 535, 539, 542, 620, 647, 650
Dravidian influence 598
Durgā 586
dvādaśāha 489, 535 n.
Dvaidha 513
dvaidhasūtra 484 n., 516, 519, 524, 645

eclecticism 498, 518, 536, 573 n., 593
eighteen 557 n.
Ekāgnikāṇḍa 579 n., 651 n.
eke 483, 485 n., 520, 521 n., 530, 640
elaboration 638
embryo 574f.
emendation 649
enumeration 552, 557 n., 560, 561 n., 596, 601, 624, 627 n., 634, 639, 645 n.
epic literature 478, 644
epigraphic records 487, 593, 660
epithet 577 n.
euphemism 645 n.
evil 565, 570, 583, 589, 600, 625
exactness 629, 632
exegesis 651
exorcism 573 n.
expiations 499, 519, 526, 565, 570
explanation(s) 498, 503, 504, 515, 529, 533, 598, 610, 611, 617, 618, 632, 633, 649, 650, 653

families (peculiarities of) 561
family life 547
family names 486 n.
family traditions 561, 649
Fathers (rites for the) 512, 556, 564
feeding 558
fire cult, ritual 468, 515, 523, 551, 556, 561, 597
first-fruits (sacrifices) 468, 499
floating tradition 480, 505, 508, 553, 572f.
footsteps 559, 577
formulaic expressions 497 n., 635, 640
formulas 534, 545, 556, 565, 571, 572f., 575, 580
formulation (emphatic) 516
full moon and new moon days (sacrifices of) 468, 489, 491f., 500, 515, 548 n., 549, 612, 630
functions of *mantras* 568ff.
funeral ceremonies 468, 551, 552, 573n., 596, 600, 608, 616ff., 654, 656
funeral hymns 575

Gadādhara 602
Gālava(s) 522
gāna(s) 543
Gāṇagāri 484, 532 n.
Gaṅgādhara 600 n.
Garbe, R. 543, 661
garbhādhāna 555, 557
Garga 535
Gārgya Gopālayajvan 618 n., 650
Gārgya Nārāyaṇa 531, 534 n., 603 n., 605, 642 n., 650, 653 n.
gāthā 565, 642f.
Gaurīśa Śarma 659
Gautama(s) 474, 484, 485, 539, 540, 616, 620
Gautama-Gṛhyasūtra 611
Gautama-Pitṛmedhasūtra 616, 620
Gautama-Śrāddhakalpa 620
gāyatra chant 542
Gāyatra-Vidhānasūtra 542
geographical location (origin etc. of texts) 487
German 546
gift 555
Gobhila 476, 483, 536, 578n., 579, 602n., 607, 608, 609, 610, 643, 659 n.
Gobhila-Gṛhyakarmaprakāśikā 608 n.
Gobhila-Gṛhyasūtra 481, 483, 536, 553, 578f., 607, 608f., 610, 627
Gobhilaputra 609

Gobhila-smṛti 659 n.
Gobhila-Śrāddhakalpa 620
godāna 560, 575 n.
goddesses 627
gods 467, 480, 512, 538, 626
Gonāmika 601 n.
Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa 513
gopitṛyajña 518
Gotranirṇaya 660
Gotrapravaramañjari 660
Gotrapravaranirṇaya 660
Govinda 533 n.
grahaśānti 657
grammatical irregularities, peculiarities 477, 522, 525, 530 n., 534, 542, 580, 598, 600, 608, 644, 651
grammatical sūtras 629, 631, 652
Greek(s) 481, 590
gṛhya 468, 513, 546 n., 547f., 553, 612
gṛhya-brāhmaṇa 550f.
gṛhyakarmāṇi 546, 556f.
Gṛhyapañcikā 621
gṛhya period (so-called) 479
Gṛhya-Saṃgraha 659
Gṛhyasaṃgrahapariśiṣṭa 609, 625
gṛhyasūtras 467 n., 468, 469ff., 474, 476, 478, 480, 488, 511, 545, III, 616, 622ff., 629, 661
guest (see also reception) 551, 566, 568, 576, 577, 607 n.
Guha 598
Guṇākhya Śāṅkhāyana 475
guruparaṃparā 649

Hairaṇyakeśa(s) 524 n., 592
Halāyudha 657f.
Haradatta 549 n., 550 n., 576, 579, 591 n., 603, 651, 652 n.
Harihara 601 n., 602, 651, 654
hautra 472, 490, 493, 521 n., 522, 633
Hautra-Pariśiṣṭas 513
havis 575
Hemādri 605, 614
Henry, V. 661
hermits 474, 595
Hillebrandt, A. 543, 582
Hinduism 586, 589, 597
Hiraṇyakeśi-Dharmasūtra 522
Hiraṇyakeśi-Gṛhyasūtra 488, 522, 553 n., 578, 591f.
Hiraṇyakeśin (see also Satyāṣāḍha) 473, 474, 482, 520, 522, 525, 526, 554, 560, 580, 591, 598, 618, 629, 655 n., 659
Hiraṇyakeśi-Pitṛmedhasūtra 618, 619
Hiraṇyakeśi-Śrautasūtra 493, 495, 501, 517, 518, 521f., 651
horse sacrifice 495, 625, 632, 642
hotar 469, 472, 473 n., 493, 495 n., 534
house-building 560, 562, 575 n., 578 n., 599, 622
Hṛṣīkeśa 537 n.
human sacrifice 481 n., 495
huta 556, 582, 583
hutānukṛti 583

Iḍā 508
identical passages 552, 553
identity of wording 479
idioms 634f.
images 584, 586, 595, 597, 627
impregnation 555, 557
improvisation 507
inapplicability (of formulas) 567f.
incantation 535, 613
incidental rites 499
Indo-Europeans 546, 547
Indra 563, 595, 626
inferiority 506 n.
influence (mutual — of schools) 487
initial formulas, *sūtras* 637, 638
initiation 558, 561, 566
interpolation(s) 479, 540, 560 n., 601, 603 n.
interpretation 472f.
interpunction 647
interrelations of *sūtra* works 661
introduction 637ff.
invocation 570
Īśāna 627
iṣṭi 468, 489, 491, 492 n., 518, 522
iṣṭikalpa 515 n., 526

Jaimini (Talavakāra) 474, 484 n., 529, 542, 553 n., 560, 609
Jaiminīya(s) 483, 487, 535, 542, 553, 608, 643, 650
Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa 524, 543
Jaiminīya-(Jaimini-)Gṛhyasūtra 553 n., 572 n., 579, 607f., 609, 651
Jaiminīya-Prayogavivaraṇa 656 n.
Jaiminīya-Śrautasūtra 507, 530, 542f., 643, 657
Janaka 488
jātakarma(n) 557f., 560, 583
Jātūkarṇya 485 n.
Jayarāma 602
Jīvadeva 660 n.

journey 558, 560, 565, 589, 625
justifications 523, 529, 629, 632
Jyeṣṭhā 586
jyotiṣṭoma 519

Kālabavin-Brāhmaṇa 486
Kāletās 524 n.
kalpa 467, 470, 473, 588, 603
Kalpa (= Ārṣeyakalpa) 536
Kalpa (of the Jaiminīyas) 542
kalpaikatva 471
Kalpānupada(-Sūtra) 536, 540
Kalpasūtra, see Maśaka-Kalpasūtra
kalpasūtras 467, 470 n., 471, 472, **554,** 579, 581, 593, 646
Kamalākara 658
kāmya 467, 536
kāmya rites *(kāmyeṣṭi)* 491, 505, **515,** 529, 612 n.
Kāṇḍānukrama(ṇika) 491, 492, 579
Kaṅkati-Brāhmaṇa 486
Kāṇva 476, 588
Kāṇva (Kaṇva) Baudhāyana 474, 476, 514
Kāṇvas (Kāṇva recension etc.) 516, 529, 658
Kapardisvāmin 618 n., 650
Kapilasaṃnyāsavidhi 589
Kapiṣṭhala-Saṃhitā 540 n.
kārikā 657, 658
Karka (Karkopadhyāya) 602, 650
Karmadīpikā 654
karmakāṇḍapaddhati 657
karmāntasūtra 509, 516, 524, 584, 645
karmapradīpa 610, 621, 659 n.
karṇavedha 587, 607, 651
Kashikar, C. G. 618
Kashmir 598
Kāśyapa 545, 581
Kaṭha(s) 526, 527
Kāṭhaka(s) 490, 495, 500, 516, 551
Kāṭhaka-cayana 495
Kāṭhaka-Gṛhyasūtra 553, 561, 570, 581, 598f., 600
Kāṭhakam 516, 527
Kaṭha-Kapiṣṭhala(s) 488
Kāṭhaka recension 598, 600
Kāṭhaka-Saṃhitā 499, 519, 527, 540 n.
Kāṭhaka school 621
Kāṭhaka-Śrautasūtra 490, 527
Kāṭhakasūtra(-praśna) 516
Kaṭha ritual 521
Kātīya see Kātyāyana
Kātīya-Gṛhyasūtra 601ff.
Kātīya-Tarpaṇaprayoga 656 n.
Kātīyeṣṭidīpika 656 n.
Kātyāyana 474, 482, 483, 488, 513, 528f., 537, 541, 601 n., 602 n., 610, 616, 633, 637, 643, 659
Kātyāyana-Gṛhyasūtra 601 n.
Kātyāyana-Smṛti 610
Kātyāyana-Śrautasūtra 483, 490, 491, 498, 513 n., 517, 520, 528f., 603, 629, 646, 650
Kātyāyana-Sūtra 489 n.
Kauṇḍinyas 522
Kauṇḍinya-Sūtra 489 n.
Kauśika 545, 614
Kauśika Rāmāgnicit 650
Kauśika-Sūtra 512, 513, 545, 571, 573, 574, 611ff., 620, 629, 630, 646, 647, 649 n., 654
Kauṣītaka-Gṛhya 606f., 620
Kauṣītaki (or Śāṅkhāyana)-Brāhmaṇa 499, 520, 530, 532, 606 n., 643
Kauṣītaki-Gṛhyasūtra 480, 576
Kauṣītakin(s) 519, 537, 616
Kauthuma(s), Kauthumin(s) 487, 490, 507, 527, 535 n., 536, 537, 538, 542, 608, 609, 610, 620, 621
Kauthuma-Gṛhya 608
Kauthuma-Gṛhyasūtra 608
Kauthuma-Saṃhitā 535, 609
Kautsa 484, 532 n.
kautuka 595
Kāvya Dālbhya 551 n.
Keith, A. B. 496
Keśasvāmin 654
Keśava 614, 615, 654
Keśavī 654
Keśin Dalbha 641
Khādira Gṛhyasūtra 483, 487, **553, 562,** 579, 610, 620, 643
Khādira-Śrāddhakalpa 620
Khāṇḍikeya(s) 524 n.
khila(s) 531
klpti 535
Kṛṣṇa 590
Kṛṣṇa-Yajurveda (see also **Black Yajurveda**) 525, 528
Kṣetrapati 627
Kṣudrasūtra 534 n., 536, 537
Kubera 626 n.
kuladharma 561
Kuṇḍamaṇḍapalakṣaṇam 655
Kuntāpa hymns(s) 531, 641
Kusīdaka-Sūtra 489 n.
kūṣmāṇḍa rite 595

Kuthuma 608 n.
Kutsa 472 n.

lacunae 527, 591
lājahoma 559
Lakṣmaṇasena 657
language (peculiarities) 477, 644f.
Lāṭyāyana 482, 483, 485, 487, 497, 536, 537, 539, 621 n., 636, 640, 641 n., 643, 647, 649
Lāṭyāyana-Śrautasūtra 483, 486, 490, 509, 535, 536, 538f., 540, 541, 542, 543, 609, 631, 632, 647, 652
Laugākṣi 598
Laugākṣi-Gṛhyasūtra 527, 598f., 647, 649 n.
Laugākṣismṛti 598 n.
legends 523, 526, 641
length (of *sūtras*) 634
libation 578 n.
liṅga 570 n.
liturgical *saṃhitās* 575
liturgical suitability (of formulas) 567
liturgical tradition 503
liturgy 467, 497
Löbbecke, R. 496
local customs, traditions 561, 562
Lokākṣita-Sūtra 489 n.
loose style 636
lost (branches of the Veda etc. that are —) 489, 507, 527, 540, 552, 566 n.
loṣṭaciti 616 n.
Loṣṭacitiprayoga 655 n.
lute-playing 616, 621, 643 n.

madhuparka 543, 577
Madhva, Madhvācārya 465 n., 593
Mādhyaṃdina(s) 529
Mādhyaṃdina-Gṛhyasūtra 602 n.
Mādhyaṃdina recension 602
Mādhyaṃdina-Sūtra 489 n.
Mahābhārata 515, 593
Mahādeva 482, 586
Mahānāmnī 531
Mahāpuruṣa 586
Mahārāja 626 n.
Mahārṇava 487 n., 488
mahāvrata 533, 534
mahāyajñāḥ 557 n., 602, 604
Mahīdāsa 608
Maitrāyaṇī recension 476, 490, 525
Maitrāyaṇī-Saṃhitā 499, 501, 519, 526
Maitrayaṇisūtra 527 n.
Maitrāyaṇīya(s) 488, 492, 496, 600
Maitrayaṇīya-Brāhmaṇa 486
Maitrayaṇīya-(Mānava-)Gṛhyasūtra 600
Mānava(s) 473 n., 476, 483, 488, 493, 616, 659
Mānava-Dharmaśāstra (see also Manu) 596 n.
Mānava-Gṛhyasūtra 527, 553, 578, 599f.
Mānava-Kalpasūtra 526 n.
Mānava-Śrautasūtra 490, 501, 525f., 600, 601, 619, 646, 647, 651
Mañcana 656 n.
mantra(s) 489, 490, 491, 498, 500, 502ff., 509f., 515, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 529, 534, 535, 536, 537, 543, 544, 545, 550, 553, 555, 558 n., 559, 565ff., 583, 587, 591, 592, 594, 597, 600, 603 n., 605, 607f., 611, 612, 613, 614, 617, 621, 625, 630, 632, 634, 637, 654, 657, 658, 659, 660
Mantrabhāṣya 581
Mantra-Brāhmaṇa 572n., 578, 579, 607, 608, 611
mantrapāṭha 545, 573f.
Mantrapāṭha 579, 591
Mantraprašna 651 n.
Mantra-Saṃhitā 525, 580
mantras (different — used in the same ritual) 567
mantras used in different rites 566f.
mantras with 'double function' 576f.
Manu, Manusmṛti 480, 607
manuscripts 487, 517 n., 518, 519, 525, 527, 542, 579, 604, 608, 612, 618 n., 646, 647, 648f., 655
marriage 469, 546, 547, 575, 583, 598n., 599
marriage ceremonies 546, 552 n., 554, 555, 558f., 561, 566, 567, 571, 573, 585, 590, 608
Maruts 563
Maśaka 535, 536, 538
Maśaka-Kalpasūtra 535, 542
Mātrālakṣaṇasūtra 541
Mātṛdatta 570 n., 591 n., 592
memorial stanzas 480, 586 n., 657
metaphorical interpretation 568
metres 478 n., 536, 537, 538, 554
metrical sections, texts (see also ***śloka***, verses) 590, 609
mīmāṃsā 529 n.
Mīmāṃsā 650
Mīmāṃsāsūtra 540
misfortune 570
Miśra Bālakṛṣṇa 651

mnemonic devices 649
Moḍha(ka) brahmins 600
molehills 563
monotony 529, 534
moon 558, 560
morning litany 508
motivations 498, 511, 515, 533, 540, 542, 584, 585 n., 610, 618, 633
Mūlyādhyāya-Pariśiṣṭa 513
music 622, 623 n.
myths 515, 534, 562

naimittika 467
naiṣṭyayana oblations 641
nakṣatra 560
nakṣatrahoma 587
Nakṣatrakalpa 615
Nambudiri Taittirīyakas 522 n.
name 625f.
name (of authority mentioned) 483
name-giving 558, 560, 593, 626
Nāndīmukha-śrāddha 596
Nārāyaṇa (commentator) 550n., 552n., 560 n., 604, 605 n., 606, 609, 654, 657
Nārāyaṇa (god) 596, 597, 627
Nārāyaṇabali 588, 627
Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa 655 n., 656
narrative episodes 629, 630, 641
Navakuṇḍa-Vidhi 654f.
navayajña 563 n.
new home 559, 562
nidāna 536
Nidānasūtra 470 n., 536f., 539, 540, 643
Nidhanasūtra 541
nigada 530
Nigama 602 n.
Nigama-Pariśiṣṭa 513 n.
Nīlakaṇṭha 658
Nirṇayasindhu 658
niṣkramaṇa 558
nitya 467
nivids 531
nominal sentences 634, 644
non-Aryan practices 547
non-ṛgvedic mantras 571
non-yajurvedic mantras 571

oblational *mantras* 568
obsolescence of rites 550 n.
occasional ceremonies 602f.
Oldenberg, H. 551, 580, 591, 661
omission of subject, object etc. 630f.
optional prescripts, ritual acts 484, 497 n.
oral instruction 465
oral tradition 473, 480, 485, 496, 498, 514, 552, 607, 629 n., 649
oral transmission 466, 517, 531, 572
oratio recta 640
order see arrangement
ornament 567
orthography 648

paddhati(s) 495, 557 n., 592, 599, 605, 615, 653ff.
Padmayoni 484
Paiṅgalāyani-Brāhmaṇa 486
Paiṅgāyani-Brāhmaṇa 486
Paippalāda recension 544, 574, 615
pākayajña 547 n., 556, 557 n., 582, 584, 585, 599, 612
Pāliṅgāyanika-Brāhmaṇa 487
pañcagavya 588
Pañca-Kāṭhaka-Sūtra 489
Pañcavidha-Sūtra 536, 541
Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa 486, 497, 499, 528, 535, 537, 538f., 540, 657
pañcika 599
Pāṇini 477, 529, 644
pāpmano vinidhayaḥ 518, 524 n.
parallel borrowing 576
parallelism 508, 637
parallel passages 552
parallel rites 594, 600, 631, 634
parallel versions 576
paraphrases 539
Parāśaramādhavīya 604 n.
Pāraskara 474, 476, 477, 578, 581, 591
Pāraskara-Gṛhyasūtra 483, 551, 562, 601ff., 627f., 651, 658
paribhāṣā(s) 481, 508ff., 519, 521, 528, 543, 548, 561 n., 584, 591, 612
paribhāṣā style 511
paribhāṣāsūtras 481 n., 508ff.
Pariśeṣa 542
pariśiṣṭa 491, 508, 513, 516, 527, 601, 605, 609, 610
Parjanya 563
participles 645
particles 645
partitive genitive 635
Paryadhyāya 542
paśubandha 468
Paśupati 563, 586
Paśupatiśarman 654
Patañjali 537
pavitreṣṭi 534 n., 646 n.
penances 599

Peṭṭaśāstrī 537 n.
phonetic variations 506
phraseology 515, 517, 522, 523
Phullasūtra 541
piṇḍapitṛyajña 515, 527, 534, 548, **549** n., 609
piṇḍodvāsana 656
Pitṛbhūti 603
pitṛmedha 469, 616ff.
pitṛmedhasūtras 467 n., IV
planets 481, 587 n., 589 n., **608**
pluralis auctoris 644
polemics 484, 584, 641, 651
popular belief, customs 561f., **577**, **624**, 625
portents 565, **625**
post-Vedic India 480, 481
pradakṣiṇa 547, 559
pradhāna 492 n.
Pradhānasūtra 539 n.
prahuta 556, 582, 583
praiṣa(s) 531, 565, 659
praise 569f.
Prajāpati 566
prajārthihoma 587, 588
prakṛti 468, 492 n., 630
Prāksaumikam 527
prāksoma (prāksaumika) 492, **526**, **527**, 651
prāṇāgnihotra 597
prāśita 556
Prastāvasūtra 541
pratihāra 537, 541
Pratihārasūtra 541
pratihartar 537, 541
pratīkena quotation 500, 505, 506, 517, 524, 525, 534, 535, 553 n., 566, **572**, 574, 577 n., 579, 582, 603 n., 611
prātiśākhya 536f.
pratisarabandha 587
pratiṣṭhā 586
Pratiṣṭhātilaka 661 n.
pratyavarohaṇa 563f., 582f.
pravacana 514, 517, 646
pravacanakāra 513f.
pravarādhyāya 659
Pravarādhyāya 513 n.
pravara(sūtra) 516, 521, 659f.
pravargya 491, 502, 517 n., 519, 522, 526
prāyaścitta 493 n., 499, 508, 512f., 516, 536, 565, 584, 589, 596, 597, 642 n.
Prāyaścittakalpa 512
prayer 569
prayer book 581
prayoga(s) 495, 522, 589 n., 590, 592, 605, 629 n., 646 n., 653; titles also 656 n., 658
prayoga style 513
Prayogacintāmaṇi 658
prayogadīpikā 657
Prayogamālā 656
Prayogaratna 656
prayoga-vṛtti 651, 657
precision 465, 635
pregnancy 557, 559, 560, 575, **589**, **597**
pre-*gṛhya* literature 572f.
preta(s) 607
prodigies 608
prognostication 588, 654
prohibitions 645
prolixity 506, 515, 604, 608
propitiatory rites 583, 584, 587
prosody 541 n.
proverbial sayings 480
puberty 558
pūjā 586
puṃsavana 557, 560
punarādheya 491, 515
puṇyāha 585, 587
purāṇas 468 n., 586, 590, 599, 658
purification 557, 585, 588, 659
puroḍāśi 523
purohita 604
puroruc(as) 531
Puruṣa 597
puruṣamedha (see also human sacrifice) 495
Puruṣasūkta 581, 597, 627
Puruṣottama Paṇḍita 660
Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā 467 n., 470 n., 479, 529, 541, 660 n.
Pūrvārcika 609
pūrvā tatiḥ 510
Puṣpasūtra 535, 541
putreṣṭi 600

question(s) 482
questions-and-answers 571
quotation(s) 490, 499, 506, 537, 554, 565, 571, 586n., 597, 603n., 629, 640f., 645, 650, 651

Rahasya 601 n.
rājābhiṣeka 587
Rājaśekhara 466 n.f.
rājasūya 469, 491, 492, **534**, **539**
Rāmacandra 651, 654
Rāmāgnicit 520 n.

Rāmakṛṣṇa 602
Rāṇāyanīya(s) 487, 490, **535** n., 537, 539, 608, 609, 611, 620
Rāṇāyanīya-Saṃhitā 535
rathakāra 480
Rauraki-Brāhmaṇa 550 n.
Ravikalpa 595
ṛc(as) 536, 541, 579
ṛcaka 657
recapitulative sentence construction 630 n., 643
recensions (of *sūtras*) 497, 499, 553, 604
reception of guest (bridegroom) 559, 564
reciprocity 508
recitation (of the Veda) 534, 608, 629 n.
reconstruction 652 n.
redactor 513, 517, 576
references 478, 479, 485, 497, 506, 520, 531, 537, 583, 603, 631, 635, 640, 660
regional variations in domestic rites 608
relations (mutual) of *śrautasūtras* 501
remainder 498, 583 n.
Reṇuka 651
repeated death 523
repetition 515, 535, 585, 631
replacements 517
restriction 636
revelation (see also *śruti*) 562
revision 476, 479, 540
Ṛgveda 472, 478, 490, 496, 502, 520, 529, 546, 547, 549, 554, 573, 582, 612
Ṛgveda-Mantrasaṃhitā 581
Ṛgveda-Saṃhitā 469, 531, 571, 573, 574, 579, 605
Ṛgvidhāna 575
rhetorical question 637
right (hand etc.) 624
rites, ritual 467, 485, 496ff., 522, 555, 556, 559
ritual application 570
ritual (forms of) 480, 486
ritual practice 652, 660
ritual problems 524
ritual recension of the Ṛgveda **573**
ritualistic particulars 520
Roman 564
Roth, R. (von) 496 n.
ṛṣi 468, 502, 516, 659
Ṛtuparṇa 515
Rudra 563, 570, 583 n., 584, **586, 626f.**
Rudradatta 520 n.
Rudradeva 656
rule (generalization of a special —) **511**
rules (general) 511
sacramental *mantras* 568
sacraments 469, 556ff.
sacred cord, thread 585
sacrifice(s) 467, 489, 535, 538, 630
sacrificer (see also *yajamāna*) 468, **534n.**, 616f., 660
sacrificial place 467, 493, 585, 587, 594, 602, 632, 655
saḍāhutam 600
Ṣaḍguruśiṣya 475
Ṣaḍviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa 486, 497, 535, 657
Śailālin Brāhmaṇa 486
Śākala recension 531, 534, 606
Śākala-Sūtra 489 n.
Śākalya 476 n., 619
śākhā 475, 486, 490, 491, 492, 499, **505**, 525, 553, 562, 573 n., 593, 595 n., **643**
śākhāntara 507 n.
Śālīki 484, 485, 516, 550 n.
sāmaklpti 538
sāman(s) 535, 536, 541, 542, **543**
Samantraka-Cārāyaṇīya-(Kāṭhaka-) Gṛhyasūtra 599
Sāmatantra 541
samāvartana 469, 551, 558, 567, **576n.**, 583, 646
Sāmaveda 472, 490, 497, 507, **534ff.**, 549, 582, 609, 611, 612, 620
Sāmaveda-Saṃhitā 469
sāmavedic *mantras* 578
Śāmbavīyasūtra 606 n.
Śāmbhavya 606
saṃhitā 468, 470, 479 n., 481 n., 489, 490, 491, 496 n., 502, 507, 549f., 565, 571, 573, 632
saṃnyāsin 589, 595
saṃpraiṣa 644 n.
saṃskāra(s) 469, 484, 555, 556ff., 583, 596, 598, 601, 602, 608, 617, 630, 654, 656, 657, 660
Saṃskārakaustubha 658
Saṃskāramayūkha 658
Saṃskāraratnamālā 658
Śāṇḍilya 485, 486, 539, **540, 593 n.**
Śāṇḍilya-Gṛhyasūtra 603
Śāṇḍilya-Sūtra 489 n.
Śāṅkha(s) 522
Śāṅkhāyana 474, 476, 483, 485, **487**, 509, 532f., 552, 568, 572, 578, **591**, 606, 616, 620, 643
Śāṅkhāyana-Āraṇyaka **475**, 533
Śāṅkhāyana-Brahmakarmapaddhati 654 n.

Śāṅkhāyana-Gṛhyasūtra 548, 552, 560, 562, 574, 576, 603, 605ff., 642, 651
Śāṅkhāyana-Śrautasūtra 477 n., 490, 499, 508, 529f., 532ff., 548, 551, 552, 620, 641, 642, 654
śānti 587, 589, 608, 617
Śāntikalpa 615
śāntikarman 600
saptapadī rite 559 n.
Sarasvatī 586, 589, 604
Śārdūla(s) 611
sarpabali 584
sarvamedha 495
Ṣaṣṭhī 627
śatābhiṣeka 560, 587
Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa 498, 520, 524, 528, 530, 550 n., 572, 616
Śatarudriya litany 503 n., 526 n., 583 n.
sattra 469, 489, 491, 493ff., 522
Satyāṣāḍha (Hiraṇyakeśin) 474, 490, 514, 518, 522
Satyāṣāḍha-Śrautasūtra (see also Hiraṇyakeśi-ŚS.) 482, 518
Satyāṣāḍha-Sūtra 489 n.
Śaṭyāyanakam 532 n.
Śāṭyāyanasūtra 608 n.
Śāṭyāyani(s) 524 n.
Śāṭyāyani or Śāṭyāyanaka-**Brāhmaṇa** 486, 550 n.
Saubabhruva 522 n.
Śaunaka 475, 484 n., 589 n., 604, 605
Śaunaka-Gṛhyasūtra 605
Śaunakīya recension (Saṃhitā) 544, 545, 612, 615
sautrāmaṇī 480, 491, 517
sava 495
savayajñas 614
Savitar 597
Sāvitrī 547
Sāyaṇa 490 n., 550 n., 650 n.
scholasticism 489
schools 470, 472f., 474, 480, 485, 487, 502, 507, 518, 524, 526, 550, 552, 572, 574, 576 n., 582, 595, 596, 645, 646, 649 n.
school traditions 478, 572, 596, 655
seasonal sacrifices 492, 499f., 538
secondary adaptation 503
secondary literature VII
sections (of texts) 502, 517 n.
self-quotations 641
separate treatises 645f.
serpents 563, 584
seven steps 559
shaving (see also *godāna*) 577
short phrases 466
sīmantonnayana 546, 557, 560, 567
similarity of wording etc. 479, 501
sin 518
śiṣṭācāra 554
Sītā 563, 627
Śiva 481 n., 563, 586, 587
Śivaism 652 n.
sixty years 589
Skanda 586, 587, 598
Slavonic 546
śloka(s) 480, 587, 595, 599, 607, 642f.
smārta 468, 660
śmaśāna 584
śmaśānaciti 619
śmaśānakaraṇam 616 n.
smṛti 468, 599, 657, 658
Smṛtikaustubha 658
snātaka 564, 585, 598
social behaviour 555
social classes 480f., 623
social life 622ff.
soma 468f., 624, 632
Soma 564, 626
Somāditya 649 n.
soma sacrifices 468f., 480, 481 n., 489, 491, 492, 532, 535, 536, 538, 549 n., 551, 614
sorcery 575
source (common) 501
source (second-hand) 651f.
special wishes (see *kāmya* rites) 504
speculations 526
spiritual life 623 n.
spurious passages 604
Śrāddha-Brāhmaṇa 551 n.
śrāddha rites 507, 526, 548, 560, 564, 584, 585, 587, 588, 590, 602, 608, 619, 656
śrāddha texts 602 n.
Śrautakārikā 475 n.
śrauta rites 468f., (enumeration of and literature on —), 491, 492ff., 547, 549, 568, 572, 576ff., 601, 660
śrautasūtras 467 n., 468ff., 476, 478, 479, 480, II, 548, 549ff., 554, 566, 567, 575, 577 n., 580, 582, 603, 616, 622, 623 n., 629ff., 655 n., 659
Śrāvaṇa 563
Śrī 586, 589, 597
Śrīdatta 658
Śrīnivāsa 607 n., 651
Śrīnivāsadīkṣita 651

Śrīnivāsārya 657
Śrīsūkta 581
śruti 468, 473, 491, 550 n., 551, 640, 653
Stenzler, A. F. 651
stereotyped style 636f., 640
sthāgara alaṃkāra 594
sthālīpāka 556, 561, 563
stobha(s) 541
Stobhānusaṃhāra 541
stoma(s) 535
stotra(s) 535, 542, 659
structure (of works) 520, 601, 602
study of the Veda 558
style 472, 481, 482, 498, 506, 509, 512, 513, 517, 518, 520, 523, 524, 525 n., 536, 552, 554, 584, 590, 593, 600, 608, 612, 615, 617, VI, 652
subordinate clauses 645
subrahmaṇyā litany 540
succinct formulation 501, 552, 615
Sudarśamārya 591 n., 651
śūdra(s) 623, 625
suggestive *mantras* 570
Śukla Yajurveda (see also White Yajurveda) 529
śūlagava 556 n., 570, 582, 583, 627
śulva(śulba)sūtras 467 n., 470, 473, 516, 526, 601 n.
sun 558, 568
Sun 586, 589, 595
Śunaḥśepa 530 n., 534, 642
Śuṅga 542
superfluity 632 n., 634, 636 n.
superscriptions 637
supplementary texts (see also *pariśiṣṭa*) 513
Sūryā 547
Sūryāsūkta 547, 574
Suśārada Śālaṅkāyana 540 n.
sūtakāgni 585
sūtra(s) 465ff., 514, 574, 658
sūtrakāra(s) 470, 474ff., 477, 483, 486, 497, 498, 507, 508, 513, 514, 517, 522, 524, 529, 535, 539, 551, 553, 558, 572, 574, 576, 583 n., 593, 609, 613, 621, 636, 644
sūtra literature 471
Sutrārthabodhinī 611 n.
sūtra style 465, 470 n., 478 n., 506, 515, 529, 535, 541, 585, 615, VI
sūtra (the term) 466
Suyajña Śāṅkhāyana 474, 475, 530, 605
Śyāmacaraṇa Kaviratna 654 n.
syntactic incompleteness 634
syntactic irregularities 636
syntax 515, 644

Taittirīya(s), Taittirīya corpus, recension, schools etc. 473, 476, 482 n., 486, 488, 490, 491f., 498, 499, 500, 502, 506, 514, 516, 518, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 572, 580, 590, 593, 595, 616, 619
Taittirīya-Āraṇyaka 491, 502, 604, 617
Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa 491, 502, 523
Taittirīya-Prātiśākhya 593
Taittirīya-Saṃhitā 491, 502, 506, 515, 517, 523
Takṣaka 626 n.
Talavakāra (see also Jaimini) 484 n.
Tālavṛntanivāsin 657
Taṇḍālakṣaṇasūtra 534 n.
tantra 492 n., 510
Tarkālaṅkāra 609
tarpaṇa 474, 476, 482 n.
Tātparyadarśana 651
Taulvali 484, 532 n.
teacher(s) 466, 470, 473, 474, 476, 483, 484, 485, 486, 515 n., 545, 570, 593, 609 n., 640, 649, 653
technical information 632f.
technical terms, see terminology
temple 598
terminology 523, 529, 549 n., 635, 642, 644 n.
text preserved in two forms 540
three 625
tmesis 498 n.
tonsure 558, 566, 577
Totenhochzeit 598
traditional behaviour 624
traditional formulation 479
traditional lore 643, 648
traditions on ritual 551
transference (to another ritual context) 505
transition 637, 639
translation(s) 474 n., 644 n., 652 n.
transmission of texts 648f.
transposition (of a chapter etc.) 635 n.
Trikāṇḍamaṇḍana 656 n.
tṛṇagarbha 587
Tsuji, N. 496, 497, 498 n.
twice-born 557
twins 624

udgātar 469, 493, 538, 542
ūha 566

Ūhagāna 535
Ūhyagāna 535
unanimity 472
uniformity 637
Unseen 470
Upādhyāya-Karka 650
Upagrantha(-Sūtra) 536, 537f.
upākaraṇa, upākarman 583, 599
upanayana 469, 550 n., 555 n., 558, 567, 572 n., 583, 587f., 590, 592, 599
Upanayana-Brāhmaṇa 551
Upanidānasūtra 537
upaniṣads 481 n., 523
Upaśruti 586
upayamanīhoma 583
'Ur-Gṛhyasūtra' 552
Ursūtra 499
Uttarārcika 538
uttarā tatiḥ 510, 515, 516, 517
utthāna 558, 560

Vācaspatimiśra 658
Vādhūla(s) 471, 482, 488, 490, 522ff., 592f., 644, 645
Vādhūla-Gṛhyakalpa-Vyākhyā 592
Vādhūla-Gṛhyasūtra 592
Vādhūla-Pitṛmedhasūtra 592
Vādhūla-Sūtra 482, 489 n., 522, 523
Vaijayantī 482
Vaikhānasa(s) 473 n., 480 n., 482, 483, 489 n., 490, 524f., 554, 581, 595ff., 616, 659
Vaikhānasa-Dharmasūtra 524, 596
Vaikhānasa-Gṛhyasūtra 481, 524, 557, 558, 560, 580, 586
Vaikhānasa-Saṃhitā 581
Vaikhānasa-Smārtasūtra 524f., 596ff., 619, 620, 661
Vaikhānasa-Śrautasūtra 512, 524f., 651
Vaiśāleya 626 n.
vaiṣṇavam 526
vaiśvadevam 601
Vaitāna-Sūtra 490 n., 509, 512, 543ff., 614, 615
vaitānikasūtras 489 n.
vājapeya 469, 491, 492, 526, 527, 660 n.
Vājasaneyaka(m) 507 n., 520
Vājasaneyin(s) 520, 620, 658
Vājasaneyi-Prātiśākhya 529
Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā 476, 490, 519, 528f.
Vālakhilya hymns 531
Vaṃśa-Brāhmaṇa 609 n.
vānaprastha 595
Varadarāja 535
Vārāha(s) 476, 488, 495, 638
Vārāha-Gṛhyasūtra 553, 600f.
Vārāha-Pariśiṣṭas 601
Vārāha-Śrautasūtra 490, 509, 513, 525, 526f.
variant readings 481 n., 507f., 534 n., 649 n., 652
variants of rites 476, 513, 593
variation (stylistic) 636 n., 637
variations in *mantras* 507f., 565, 572, 607
variations in ritual practice 472, 513, 608
varṇa 623
vārttika(s) 529
Varuṇa 626
Vasiṣṭha (commentator) 600 n.
Vasiṣṭhas 561
vāstuśamana 584
Veda(s) 470, 471, 472, 473, 490
vedāṅga 467 n.
Veda student, study 469, 558, 560, 578 n., 584, 596, 599, 601, 616
vedavrata 558, 583
Veṅkaṭeśa 656, 658
verb forms 644f.
verses 641ff., 643 n.
vidhāna literature 610, 612
vidhi 497, 498, 501, 504, 523, **555, 632**
Vigheśvara 587
Vijñāneśvara 659
vikalpa 484
Vikhanas 480 n., 524 n., 595
vikṛti 489, 630
village life 623
Vināyaka 586, 600
viniyoga 504
Viṣṇu 481 n., 581, 586, 587, 588, 595, 596, 597, 627
Viṣṇubali 557, 560, 595
Viṣṇudaivatyam 581
Viṣṇuism 525, 589, 595, 596, 656 n.
Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa 525
viṣṭuti(s) 538
Vivāhapradīpa 659
Vivāhaprayoga 655 n.
vivaraṇa 598, 654
Vivaraṇa 650
vocabulary 518, 644 n., 645
vrata 560 n., 596, 599, 609 n.
vrātya(s) 539
vrātyastoma 539, 641
vṛṣotsarga 552 n., 563, 586, 588, **601 n.**
vṛtti 542, 650
vyākhyā 651

way of death 598
Weber, A. 496 n.
wedding *mantras* 578 n.
White Yajurveda 474, 476, 490, **492**, 507, 520, 528, 602, 603, 658
widow 618, 619
Winternitz, M. 571 n., 580, 582
wishes (fulfilment of) 575

yajamāna 468, 493
yajña 480
yajñagāthā 642
Yājñavalkyasmṛti 600
yajñavastu 627
Yājñikadeva 654
Yajurveda 472, 473, 489ff., 497, 498 n., 502, 507, 519, 535, 543, 547, 574, 579, 582, 602, 603f., 656
Yajurveda-Saṃhitās 471, 579
yajus 472, 502, 505, 517, 524, 530, 565, 579, 587, 637
yājyānuvākyās 504 n.
Yama 587, 619
Yamayajña 586, 619
Yāska 522